THEOLOGY

VOL. XLII APRIL, 1941 No. 250

EDITORIAL NOTES

THE article on " The Church Dying ", which is contributed by a young theologian of the Russian Orthodox Church, strikes deep into the meaning of Passiontide for the whole Church. So far as external circumstances go, there is as yet comparatively little to connect the state of the Church in this country with the Passion of our Lord. " And now, behold, I go bound in the spirit unto Jerusalem, not knowing the things that shall befall me there: save that the Holy Ghost testifieth unto me in every city, saying that bonds and afflictions abide me " (Acts xx, 22 *f.*). But it is not for us to hasten the process; and even if " the night cometh, when no man can work ", it is all the more urgent that the Gospel shall first be preached wherever there are men to hear, nor have we any excuse for resigning ourselves to inaction. Thus the two articles that follow Mr Lampert's are appropriately concerned with tasks that need to be undertaken forthwith—namely, radical reform of the ecclesiastical machine, and communal experiments in Christian living within a secularized society.

* * * * *

The " Revised Review " this month is of P. T. Forsyth's great Christological work. Some of us are discovering in Forsyth a theologian who spoke to our condition while we knew it not. His book, *The Justification of God* (Lectures for war-time on a Christian Theodicy), published by Duckworth in 1916, is still in print, and costs only 3s. 6d.

* * * * *

The Rev. A. M. Ramsey's inaugural lecture as Professor of Divinity in the University of Durham has just been published as a THEOLOGY OCCASIONAL PAPER. Its title is *Jesus Christ in Faith and History* (S.P.C.K., 6d.). Professor Ramsey surveys developments in New Testament theology during the last hundred years, with special reference to the study of the Gospels, and points to the tasks that most need to be undertaken to-day. We hope that the lecture will be widely read.

The Church Dying

Our time is the time of great and world-shaking historical events. The darkness, cut by flashes of ill-omened lightning, thickens. The shadows fall blacker and blacker, encircling the world and men in storms. Is it the last effort of darkness, the world's last death agony? The Apocalypse! It is the Apocalypse—this mysterious book whose words enflame the tongue, this book which roars and groans, a book yet not a book, a word yet not a word—rather an event, an accomplishment. In images which cry and clamour to heaven and earth, judgment is fulfilled, the judgment of the Apocalypse on the world: and not on the world alone, but also on the Church. It opens in the very first lines with the *judgment on the Churches of Christ.* What mystery is this? And in asking thus we are face to face with our own time. This mystery reveals the strange and terrible *powerlessness* of the Church, her impotence, her weakness and desolation. The horror not yet guessed at is that the Church of Christ is more and more clearly disappearing from the historical horizon. In reality everyone has suddenly forgotten the Church, although some still declaim rhetorically about her. She did not prevent all the present historical catastrophes, and only seems to sing, to sing perpetually in her impotence and anguish. Life has led to tormenting discords and tragic desperation, and humanity, wounded and exhausted by sufferings, remains without an answer to its questioning. In the thunder of war and world-shakings, the final destinies of the Church, the convulsions of her death-agony, seem to be fulfilled. The Church dying! . . . We must not deaden this question for the sake of pseudo-apologetics, for the sake of false and self-deceptive felicity, which is flight from one's spiritual destiny, from one's historical cross. For it is the questioning of the Church herself, and at the same time a call and longing for her. To-day the need is not to defend the Church in the face of the tragically stricken world, and its destiny, but to disclose this destiny, for it is the destiny of the Church herself; it tears out the heart of her life, revealing her own real nature, which man must discover in its depth.

The Church dying! . . . The Church—the new life

in which Christ dwells and with Him and in Him the "fulness of the Godhead"! Was not the work of Christ on earth expressed just in that He founded the Church, laid the foundation of the new life of grace, bringing paradise to earth? The Church is not merely a "community of disciples" which great teachers and prophets left behind them, but the new centre of divine life which has been born and gives birth in the world, *the Body of Christ*, God Himself in His Godmanhood. It is she who is silent, overcome by the tragedy and desolation of the world, herself sinking under the weight of this tragedy.

Our premise to the understanding of this contradiction which tears apart the mind and heart of man is the idea of Divine Humanity, which reveals the nature of the Church. The actual foundation of the Church is the Incarnation of Christ the Saviour in which the whole of humanity, human nature, is united with the divine nature, the "fulness of the Godhead", in the Person of the Logos, the Second Hypostasis of the Holy Trinity, in the full mutual interpenetration of both natures. Calling the Church "the Body of Christ", the apostle witnesses to a unity of Christ with humanity in which it *becomes* and *is* the Church. How are we to understand this identification of Christ with humanity, this unity of divine human life which lies at the root of the dogma of the Church?

"The Word became flesh." God-the-Word *leaves* heaven with its untroubled peace of blessed divine being and enters *into* the very being of the created world, "becomes" creature. And first of all this "coming down from heaven" —that is, the taking on Himself of created being—must be understood and accepted with fully-conscious realism without docetically adapted interpretations, which of the reality of this "coming down" leaves nothing but the name. God becomes man, enters into human life, makes it His own, accepting all its features—temporality, limitations, infirmities, and imperfections. In the Incarnation God pre-eternal is God becoming. He divests Himself of His divine glory, He lays bare His eternal divinity to come down to human life, so that in it and through it He may make man "capable of God", deify him. We must accept this *kenosis* of the Incarnation in all its terrifying seriousness as the metaphysical Golgotha of the self-crucifixion of the Logos in time. We must accept this willing "death" of the eternal Hypostasis and His burial in time with the full

force of its implications.[1] And in the depth of the Incarnation, which through the appropriation of human nature is the identification of the Son of God with the whole human race, lies also the appropriation of sin and sins, His acceptance of them as His own. In virtue of this identification Christ stands before God bearing on Himself the sin of the whole old Adam. This sin which He took on Himself, not only ideally but in reality, weighed Him down, and He Himself answers for human sin before God. On Him, " the beloved Son, in whom the Father was well-pleased ", fell the whole burden of God's wrath against sin, which He bore. " To bear sin " does not mean merely to ascribe it ideally to oneself, remaining alien to it, but to appropriate it in reality, to live through it, to suffer with it. " The Word became flesh "—this flesh, although it is free from sin in Him *personally* by virtue of *His* sinlessness, bears in itself the whole power and effect of sin, and through His humanity this flesh, stricken by sin, becomes His own. The Just One, taking on the sin of the world, Himself becomes as a sinner in the eyes of God. He " leaves " holiness for sin and plunges into its night, the night of Gethsemane and mortal sorrow. If the Incarnation is itself the kenosis of God, the mystery of the acceptance of sin reveals the ultimate depth of this kenosis. God and sin are irreconcilable. He destroys it with the flames of His fire, and the taking on of human sin by the God-man is possible only because God humiliates Himself, exinaniates Himself, to use the technical kenotic term. God conceals and covers His divinity, while keeping the whole power of His natural being, which of course cannot be annihilated. All the same, Divinity potentializes itself, becomes devoid of its glory, ineffective, as it were, in as far as it permits the approach of sin and consents to its appropriation by the God-man, who thus becomes the *subject of sin*, without being a sinner. The Son of God bears the cross—that is, already suffers not only from the sins of the world, which fight Him from without, but appropriates them from *within*, makes them His *own*. The agony of the Sinless One comes from sin which has

[1] I cannot here expound the doctrine of kenosis in detail: its negation, however, leads to the negation of, and doubt in, the whole work of Incarnation. This does not mean at all that we are bound to the Protestant theories of kenosis in the style of B. F. Gess, Mackintosh, Sanday, and others, which lack dogmatic depth and are often real heresies.

become *His own*. And in Him everyone can find himself and an answer to the torture of his sin. This participation and sharing is absolutely real in its whole intensity; it is, and can be, an absolute *equivalent* of sin, without being an actual sin. And naturally this equivalent would still be docetic if it were not accompanied by all the results of sin—that is, the burden of the wrath, judgment, and rejection of God.

The black cloud of sin which gathered round the Son of God was so thick that it covered heaven and cut Him off from the Father; its breath was so deadly, its experience so dreadful, that Christ's divine-human nature shivered and trembled convulsively. This is the cup of Gethsemane. It is accepted in the night of Gethsemane and it is drained on Golgotha, when the judgment of God's love falling on the Son reaches its final power in the loneliness and God-forsakenness of the Cross in the face of death: "Why hast Thou forsaken Me?" Thus *died* the God-forsaken God-man, thus His humanity died and His divinity was extinguished—and yet Christ eternally and unchangeably remains God. Such is the paradox of divine kenosis. We must be aware of the whole terrible reality of this dying. Art has been able to speak of it best of all, better than abstract theological schemes, which hurriedly and akenotically anticipated the image of a glorified Christ. There is one amazing picture of Christ in the tomb by Hans Holbein (Basles), who here went further than many other artists. A human body in death is tormentingly and naturalistically depicted, covered with wounds and diseases, deformed and defaced. The mutilation and deformation of Christ's image is terrible—a torn and naked corpse "marred more than any man" (Isa. lii, 14): "He hath no form nor comeliness, and when we shall see Him, there is no beauty that we should desire Him" (Isa. liii, 2). This body of Christ grown cold and bloodless, covered with the marks of death, is a challenge of suffering, death, and deformation.[1] What is this? An effort of impressionism to achieve a great effect, excite the nerves? Or is it the salutary although

[1] The history of art witnesses that Holbein used as a model the corpse of a drowned Jew. Dostoevsky, the great Russian writer, in the mouth of the "Idiot", says of the impression produced by this picture, that "some might lose their faith because of it". The terrible power of the reality of death is expressed also in the "Crucifixion" by Matthias Gruenewald (Colmar).

terrible thought that Christ really took on Himself our weaknesses and our diseases in all their cruel and merciless actuality? From this we cannot turn our face or our thought aside, for it gazes into us to-day in the fate of the Church and the world. It is the terrible truth about the divine-human dying of the God-man, the sorrow of a poisoned cup of sin, in which each recognizes and finds his own destiny appropriated and accepted by the Saviour of the world.

It is true that only once in time Christ took this burden on Himself, yet this happened also beyond time and for all time and is therefore continued in time. Christ is crucified eternally and for all time; Christ's bloody wounds, once received on Golgotha, are still torn and lacerated, and eternally He takes upon Himself the sin of man by His divine and human love, the sin which he bears and which he is living out. And His wounded body is also the body of the Church—that is, the life of Christ in men and the life of men in Christ. Christ is active in the Church, *not only through grace*, in the power of the Holy Spirit, who reveals Christ to us (Pentecost); the Church is the Body of Christ not only in the sense of His glorified and transfigured body, but by the power of the Incarnation, by His God-Manhood—that is, in fact and in *this* sense she is *naturally* His body, comprises everything human and the whole of humanity, includes all its paths and destinies, its torture and sufferings, its defeats and weaknesses.[1] In the Church, sick and dying in the world, Christ sickens and dies; in her deformed and stricken divine-human face we see *His* wounded Face scarred with the scars of human sin. " There is no soundness in my flesh; neither is there any rest in my bones, because of my sins. For my iniquities are gone over my head; as an heavy burden they are too heavy for me. My wounds stink and are corrupt because of my foolishness. I am troubled; I am bowed down greatly; I go mourning all the day long. For my loins are filled with a loathsome disease; and there is no soundness in my flesh. I am feeble and sore broken . . . and I was a dumb man that openeth

[1] We can understand this dogmatically by analogy with the Church Year, in which the Church remembers—that is, actually " repeats "—various events in the life of Christ both before and after His glorification, which happened once in time, and which are as it were drowned in it, yet which have in reality a significance which is above time and for all time.

not his mouth" (Ps. xxxviii). Thus the psalmist sings prophetically through his agony of the humiliation of the Saviour of the world. This is why the Church is weak, this is why the emptiness of her abasement and exinanition yawns so terribly and she trembles in her death agony, and darkness has surrounded her, and she is dumb and silent, forsaken by God. Yet her weakness is the weakness of the Son of God Himself in the deathly darkness of *His* abasement and God-forsakenness, her strickenness in sin is the strickenness of the Redeemer of the world who has identified Himself with this strickenness. The Body of Christ is crucified, but itself bears, as it were, the terrible guilt of this crucifixion, bears because it redeems it, is impotent because it bears the impotence of the world and its curse, and dies because it dies with the dying world. One must not be disturbed by the paradox and antinomy of this thought, for this antinomy is inherent in the very doctrine of the Incarnation, of Christ's taking on Himself of human nature and final identification of Himself with it. Hence it is no more possible to conceive the Church in that simple, benign, placid, and untragic way which is based on the division of the world into those who are being saved within the walls and precincts of the Church, in her blessed ark, where everything is happy, joyful, and radiant, and those perishing in the world, and the world perishing, where everything is drowned in the raging ocean of evil and sin, where everything is unhappy, desolate, and dark. For there are no such walls, and the Church shares the terrible sorrows and tortures of the world. There are no "wicked ones" justly writhing in agony, and "good ones" separated from this evil fate and dwelling in the undisturbed peace and bliss of the Church, for it is given to no one and to no thing to separate itself from the tragic destiny of the world and man, to abandon his tortures, his sufferings and questionings. The Church is dying, for Christ is dying in the world, bearing its death, its judgment and curse, and this is expressed in our moment of time, precisely in our moment.

Here is the unsolved mystery of the Apocalypse, of its call and judgment, of its storm and silence. . . . "And knowest not that thou art wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked" (Rev. iii, 17). This is the judgment which God spews out on the Church; this is the judgment on the world's sin which lies on the Church, which enters within her, which creates that terrible and

mysterious separation and alienation in the divine-human abasement of Christ and the divine-human abasement of His Church. . . . "And there appeared a great wonder in heaven, a woman clothed with the sun . . . and she being with child *cried, travailing in birth, and pained to be delivered*" (Rev. xii, 1). And going out into the desert she cries with dried and cracked lips to the coming and already glorified Jesus. . . . This is a terrible and overwhelming thought, because we touch the last mystery of God's abasement and the God-forsakenness of the Saviour of the world and His Church. But it is a sublime, a prophetic, and a comforting thought. If we had been at the events of Gethsemane and Golgotha, we should have trembled from the feeling that everything is ruined and lost. To-day, also, we tremble in the face of what is happening. Yet it is happening in Christ and with Christ. As to Him, He cannot cease or be destroyed. And more and more intensely we gaze into the surrounding darkness. The shadows fall blacker and blacker. Deeper and deeper the chasms furrow the dried earth. This darkness is the world's tragic destiny and the tragedy of the Church, of her destinies and of the way of her Head Himself, Christ the God-man redeeming the world in them and through them. The deeper the death, the more impenetrable the night, the more desperate the darkness—the brighter the light will shine in it. One has to die with all the power and depth of death, live through sin, taste death, that through it, in it, and out of it the light of resurrection may shine.

Let this amazing and holy, this strange and terrible, this redeeming thought be thrown like the dim sign of a great prediction into the raging whirlpool of our historical moment, in which Christ divests Himself of His glory, is crucified and torn asunder, yet is glorified and throned in the thunder of its catastrophes and earthquakes.

E. LAMPERT.

"A New Deal" for the Church of England[1]

A DISCUSSION, and even more practical reform, of the economy and institutional machinery of the Church is likely to be confused and misdirected unless the twofoldness

[1] The substance of a sermon before the University of Oxford in St Mary's, on Sexagesima Sunday, February 16, 1941.

of the Church is sufficiently recognized. The Church is holy and catholic, parochial and universal, divine and human.

The Church is a Christ-bearing society, mediating the grace, pardon and power of God to men, and also the means through which the common life is lifted up to Him. It has to hold before men the ideal of perfection and to bring them courage and sustaining power to persevere towards that ideal, which human sin makes impossible of complete achievement. The Son of God calls Church as well as disciple to bear His Cross. It has, therefore, continually to be measuring its practice by the saving Word of the New Testament, proclaiming the doctrine of God and of man therein set forth, not only by the preaching of prophets and the teaching of doctors, but also by the quality of the corporate life—the total witness of the whole institution.

The Church on earth, nevertheless, is body as well as spirit. It has organization and century-old traditions; it owns property, raises income and spends it; it has a paid ministry, and through its members has ties with and roots in the ordinary secular community. To be in a world which is wicked, and an integral part of a national life which is far short of God's rule, and yet to be uncorrupted and super-national in vision and loyalty, requires of its leaders heroic watchfulness and of its members a perpetual fear and love of God's Holy Name. In the tension of this twofold character and function, understood, felt and accepted, lie the integrity of its life and the compelling strength of its witness. The continual temptation is to escape from this unresting temptation into an unbeatific peace, either by excessive worldliness or by an otherworldly pietism, or to swing uneasily from one excess to the other.

As the Church, so the parson. He ought to be a man of God, who in word and deed stands on the Godward side of his fellow-men, and also a man among men. For him, as for other Christians, the here and now, family and neighbour relationships have to be the medium through which the complementary truths are exemplified, that man does not live by bread alone, and that daily bread is a holy thing. Once that is seen and felt, the connexion between the economy of the Church and the work of the clergy becomes clear. And this leads to the question, What is the right status of the clergy in society, and, precisely, in the class-ridden, money-bitten, half-educated society of our

time? The question does not admit of an easy answer. They should be educated men who enjoy the cultural inheritance of our civilization, better trained for their work than the average training at present allows. They have to witness to a fine standard of truth and right. Even as God is no respecter of persons, purses and clothes, so the ministers of the Church must ever try to live among rich and poor as men who know that such distinctions are of little account in the eyes of God and that in the form of great inequalities they are wrong. How, then, is the parson to live in a slum, in a suburb, in a country parish, or in a cathedral city? In what sort of establishment and upon how much? And what about his wife and children?

Moreover, the fellowship of the ministry and its corporate discipline ought to exemplify and foster the social values and the quality of personal relationships for which and by which the Church stands. What, then, should be the tenure of his office? What should be the measure of financial equality between priest and priest, and between priest and bishop? And what the method of their appointment?

I ask these questions, not in order to answer them—that would take a book—but in order to make the point that the sort of answer given in practice will to a large extent determine the function, colour the outlook, and affect the pastoral work of the clergy. Unless, therefore, a continuous attempt is made to refer to the standards and precepts of the New Testament, and also to consider the status and economic position of the ministry in the light of the contemporary mission of the Church, the economy may handicap that mission and hinder true fellowship.

That has happened and is happening, and to-day churchmen have become aware of it. Not only ardent young reformers, but also men with long pastoral and administrative experience, know that the economy of the Church of England is making almost impossible its good ordering. There are at least four great hindrances. For example:

1. *The resources of the Church are inadequate* to the needs and opportunities at home and overseas. The average benefice income before the war was just over £400, and in a majority of cases—I am hazarding a guess—the house that went with it was suited to a family man with an income of four figures. Even if one were to level down all the well-favoured benefices, spoil cathedrals and beggar bishops, there would not be enough to provide a sufficient income for a

married clergy from endowments, and there would be nothing in hand to meet the increasing need for endowing more non-parochial pastoral and specialist posts.

2. *The inequalities of endowment between parish and parish are irrational and notorious.* These, together with the disparity between the pension and income of parish clergy and of dignitaries, hinder true community. They corrupt most subtly the vocational sense of even the best men. They lead to livings often being considered more or less important for irrelevant, mundane reasons.

3. *This, in turn, leads to waste of man-power.* The Church is unable to concentrate its man-power at strategic points—*i.e.*, new housing areas. The population is mobile; but the clergy are immobile because endowments are so largely parochial.

While there are many parishes under-staffed, there are too many which do not provide a day's work except on Sundays for men of normal health. Frequently a decision to move or not to move is determined, not by the character of the man and the work to be done, but by the size of the house and financial considerations. We should rightly lose confidence in the leadership of the fighting services if some high appointments could only be given to men with private incomes. But so it still is in the Church.

4. *The units of work need revision.* The changing pattern of English life requires a modification of the parochial system. While a parson to every "toun" remains a sound principle, not every community in the modern world can be measured by acreage, and many a parish is too small or ill-shaped to be a community. Both in town and country there is need for some larger parochial groupings to be worked by a large staff, as was not infrequent in Medieval England. By setting some men to impossibly large tasks and leaving others in impossibly small ones, and asking many to live in houses far too large for the income provided, the Church is not caring well for the souls of its clergy. Some are losing heart and the cutting edge of their faith as the years pass. A bishop said recently that our resources were too often left in cold storage. Only an exceptional man of God, if he is left for years in cold storage, can maintain his spiritual temperature at the level required for an effective ministry. These and like hindrances not only impair the efficiency of the ministry, they also hinder the Church's presentation of the love of God to men. The reform of

these hindrances and evils is made difficult, and, indeed, they are partly occasioned, by two other features of the Church's economy—features not traceable to the New Testament, but to early English custom and law—private patronage and the parson's freehold, and their combined influence in operation.

Let it be said at once that there is not one ideal way of appointing either incumbent or bishop. That which looks most pure on paper may become corrupt in practice. It is not desirable that all patronage should be in the hands of bishops or ecclesiastical boards. There is value in variety. What is hurtful is the amount of private patronage and the fact that it can be exercised with little knowledge of the clergy and insufficient care for the needs of parish and diocese. More than half the benefices of England are in private patronage, including party trusts; of the remainder, 1 in 8 are in University or College patronage, 2 in every 15 are in Crown patronage, and the balance with ecclesiastical bodies and persons. There are some dioceses where the amount of private patronage is well above that high average and where the bishop has too little, both in quantity and in quality, to enable him to handle the personnel of the diocese effectively.

According to the angle of approach, it is easy either to applaud or to abuse *the clerical freehold.* It gives to its holder security and independence (where his stipend is drawn from endowments). It enables a man to withstand authorities, episcopal or totalitarian, and to stand up, when necessary, to his parishioners—especially the parson whose strength and grace of personality are not sufficient for such tasks unless they are reinforced by economic freedom and security. On the other hand, it does not promote *esprit de corps* and professional competence; it renders bishop and parishioners quite helpless in many situations where they ought to have some say; it makes the holder of a freehold, be he bishop, lawyer or incumbent, the sole arbiter in regard to moving and retiring. Thereby it is making impossible the kind of administrative elasticity we need. It is an anachronism in English life. Similar freeholds in other services and in the universities have been abolished to the benefit of society.

What, then, can be done? Very little so long as each parish remains a separate economic unit, and patrons and incumbents hold fast to all their present privileges. But if the Church as a corporate body through the appropriate

organ were put in possession of all parochial endowments and were to have effective control of their use, then a minimum stipend might be paid to all clergy after they had served a probationary period and so long as they maintained a certain standard of work and conduct. If to this minimum family allowances were added, then clerical poverty would be relieved at the point where it presses most hardly. If on the basis of common priesthood there were a uniform minimum remuneration of all clergy, including bishops, then additions, some of them substantial, might be made according to the responsibilities, needs and expenses of the particular parish or office, and with some reference to local endowments and benefactions. This discrimination ought to be made not centrally, but by dioceses through a small, partly elective commission. I see no moral or practical objection to inequalities if they are not so wide as they are at present and have a fair and reasonable basis.

Before such assessments of income could be made, the Church would have to invest a large amount of capital in the rehousing of its clergy, reconditioning, pulling down, building afresh houses relevant to the income of those who have to live in them—and doing it on a large scale—not houses uniform in pattern, but of some uniformity in size and in running costs.

If the clergy, including dignitaries, were thus given a measure of economic security, they might be willing, and they might fairly be asked, to surrender their absolute freehold and also to accept a retiring age. Patrons and parishioners would have to be persuaded not to be too exclusively parochial in their outlook and to be more ready to believe that the good of the whole often in the long run determines the welfare of the part; in short, to be more church-minded and co-operative.

The parochialism which sometimes is far removed from the catholicities of Church life and work is, none the less, the perversion and caricature of a good thing—namely, love of a particular portion of the earth and attachment to a particular community.

"And David longed, and said, Oh that one would give me to drink of the water of the well of Bethlehem, which is by the gate!"

The weakening of this sentiment in migratory town-dwellers is an impoverishment of the nation's life. The abused parish pump has been a nursery of English democracy,

and local patriotism is to-day one of the surest safeguards against totalitarian encroachments. The religion of the countryman is rooted in the soil of his place, and in the mystery of life and growth, and as Middleton Murry says, "the country church is still the focus of the life of the village community". Love of native place and sense of local community are sentiments which the natural man rightly brings into the Church and to which the Church in the ordering of its house should pay due reverence. Moreover, affection rather than reason prompts generous giving; and with most men affection is given to the particular rather than to the general. And let it be noted again that the Church's resources are far short of its needs, if it is to evangelize the "unchurched" and build up the faithful in days when the omnicompetent State is a powerful and wealthy competitor in the field of youth's activities.

On the other hand, a universal, catholic Church cannot connive, for worldly-wise reasons, at the worship of the local high place, be it of Jahweh, Ashtoreth or the Baalim. An affection expended with an intense particularity on "my church" rather than on the Church of God is less than Christian. In times past it has been too much encouraged and condoned in English Churchmen, so that, maybe imperialist in politics, they are often Little Englanders of the smallest stature in their churchmanship, caring for the parochial garden without lifting their eyes to the fields beyond, having little faith that the God of their Bethels is also the Father of the Ethiopian, and with no compelling vision of an ecumenical Church commissioned of Christ to a world-wide task.

In the business of reform, then, a fine balance has to be kept between sentiment and reason, uniformity and variety, order and freedom, local and central, rural and urban, parochial and catholic. The theorist, be he conservative or radical, who confronts us with an "either . . . or" forgets the peculiar aptitude of the English people for evading such dilemmas in their practice.

That the reform of an ancient institution requires perseverance and wisdom does not excuse timidity and continued delay. The morale of the ministry is being undermined and the spirit of the whole sapped by a bad economy. It is by the grace of God that morale is as good as it is. A Church whose fabric is allowed to become a picturesque anachronism, its machinery cumbersome and

slow, carries too much dead weight in these apocalyptic days. It cannot hope to guide the life of England if its economy does not exemplify the social principles which it proclaims.

These last paragraphs are being embodied in a book of composite and corporate authorship about to be published by Longmans, entitled *Putting our House in Order*. This article will serve a good purpose if it makes readers of THEOLOGY turn to that book for a fuller treatment of the subject, better still if it persuades Anglican readers that they must take decisive action through their representative and legislative bodies. The difficulties in the way of such action are formidable, not merely because the opposition of vested interests will be strong, but also because the necessary reforms must be enacted as a whole though perforce they will have to be discussed piecemeal. It will require a deal of sustained, patient, persevering effort in the dioceses and at the centre, supported by much prayer, if they are to be achieved in our time.

Churchmen may fairly ask the Episcopate to initiate proposals, seeing that its members are best placed to survey the working of the administrative machinery of the Church, and they themselves enjoy, on paper at least, the largest stipends; but the Bishops can do little unless they are supported by the Houses of Clergy and of Laity in the Assembly. Before such support is forthcoming some changes in the diocesan representation in these Houses may be necessary, for the Assembly seemed apathetic when the subject was last debated on the second report of the Parochial Endowments Commission. Action at the centre will, therefore, depend on discussion and activity among the clergy and laity in the dioceses. In order to promote this the group responsible for *Putting our House in Order* have appointed correspondents and representatives in the dioceses whose work will be to inform and stimulate the mind and conscience of local churches in the matter.

LESLIE SHEFFIELD.

The Dividends of Judgment

ONE can feel a certain sympathy with Mr John Hadham in his fulminations against the "Judgment of Godites" in his book, *God in a World at War*. His understanding of the term "judgment" may be faulty, but he is surely right in

maintaining that " it is not a synonym for consequence, at any rate in ordinary language ". We may be grateful that the Church of England as a whole has appreciated the nature of this war with a far greater insight than in 1914; constant emphasis has been laid upon the need for penitence. But there it has stopped, and to the critical mind the language of the theologian seems far removed from reality. It is said of the Protestant Separatists who fled from England to Amsterdam in the sixteenth century that they were accustomed to have lively arguments as to whether Aaron's breastplate was sea-green or blue. The Judgment of Godites are very frequently concerned with similar trivialities. The point at issue is not the truth of a dogma—on that we are all agreed—but the implications of that truth in the present situation.

By what right do we claim to limit the measure of God's judgment? In order that divine justice may be vindicated, man is being punished; we acknowledge the guilt, but we cannot usurp the prerogative of God by fixing the penalty. If the war and the social disintegration which accompanies it are the measure of God's judgment upon unregenerate, apostate man, then the very intensity of the punishment is indication of the unlikelihood that God will be so naïve as to give His children anything but pain and suffering for a very long time to come. We must not rule out the possibility that a clean-cut and imminent military victory for the Allies may be in accordance with His will—to do so would be to circumscribe His mercy. Yet there are other possibilities which must be visualized—a protracted and mutually exhaustive conflict, for example, when the ultimate victory would offer by no means the same opportunities for the re-creation of society. There are clearly men in high office in France who regard the present eclipse of their country as a just penalty for past shame and dishonour. Whatever may be said for and against this attitude, the fact remains that the Church in France, and indeed in other parts of Europe, is being compelled to relate its message to a situation which is entirely without precedent in recent times. Was the Church prepared for these circumstances either in France or elsewhere? In what spheres, if any, may the Gospel be preached and lived under the shadow of the swastika, with all that this ugly symbol implies?

It is, of course, important not to forget that God reveals Himself not only in judgment but in mercy, and that His

mercy is abundantly out of proportion to our merits. Yet there have been so many occasions to amend our lives individually as well as corporately that only widespread penitence is likely, at this late hour, to convince God that we are a redeemed people—a penitence, furthermore, which will bear fruit in the total reorientation of our conceptions of rights and duties. There have been definite signs of awakening in these later months: Mr J. B. Priestley's broadcast addresses on Sunday evenings; Sir Richard Acland's " Unser Kampf " movement; the *Tribune*, under the editorship of Mr Raymond Postgate. These and other propagandists—Mr John Hulton and Mr George Orwell, for example—have succeeded to a greater extent, I believe, than we yet realize in creating a sense of social imagination, in picturing the contrast between what is and what ought to be. It may be that their diagnosis is too superficial and that they are lacking in appreciation of the dogmatic basis of what ought to be; but there is much that the Church can learn from them. In so far as men are coming to realize more nearly what ought to be, in so far as their will to do keeps pace with their new understanding, the power of God to create harmony out of chaos is strengthened.

But that is only one side of the picture; many would feel more inclined to agree with Mr Alexander Miller in his pamphlet *Pacifism, Revolution, and Community*. " The point is that in each case (1914-1918, Munich, appeasement, and so on) society made what it could of a bad situation and then neglected to put its house in order. Society refused to repent and amend its life after 1918, and when the reckoning came in 1938 the alternatives were stark. Again society would not repent, and now (August, 1939) the alternatives are starker still. The respites which society wins for itself in crises by dubiously moral decisions, if they are not followed by real amendment of life, by a rectifying of the basic inequalities which produced the crisis, cannot be won again at the same price. Repeated compromise reduces the possibility of compromise. At each successive crisis the possible tragedy is deeper, the price of escape a more exacting obedience to the absolute ethical standard." In fact, there comes a time when mercy hammers vainly at the door that judgment has finally closed; compromise has no fourth dimension. To many it would appear that such a time has come, and if that is so, certain implications are presented to us which must be faced.

To proclaim the judgment is the beginning but not the end of the task of the *Ecclesia* in this particular historical situation. The mere fact, however, that we recognize it as a starting-point presupposes that we also recognize the consequences of each prophetic declamation. Guilt involves punishment, punishment suffering; as humanity is corporately guilty, so it is corporately punished, so its sufferings are shared. " As in Adam all die, so in Christ are all made alive." Man is a social being—that is to say, he does not realize himself save in association with fellow-men, save in community. To maintain that we can separate ourselves from the community is nonsensical: the indivisible cannot be divided. The Body of Christ thus takes upon itself the sufferings of the world and takes more than its share in so far as it is able to bear a greater burden. The individual Christian cannot escape such a responsibility even if he would; the just are crucified with the unjust, Barabbas with Jesus.

The question is not therefore to be avoided: In what manner shall we take up the Cross? It is an occasion for the heroic, not the commonplace. Let him who is so led by the Spirit bear his share of humanity's crucifixion in the front line; though if such be his resolve, let him not hesitate to proclaim it: to fail to do so is to betray the Cross as surely as those who claim a clear conscience. For those who cannot so identify themselves with national aspirations there must be another way.

The Christian News-Letter, commenting on the Rev. Patrick McLaughlin's article in the March (1940) issue of *Christendom*, says: " He believes that the true wisdom for to-day is found in the saying that when the fish have gone far out to sea we had best take to mending our nets against the return of the next tide. This involves in present circumstances a necessary limitation of the scope of Christian influence and a concentration on the basic realities of life such as our homes, our land, our immediate associates. It is not to disown the responsibilities of citizenship, but to discharge them in spheres in which citizenship means something. The true meaning of politics can be rediscovered in a community small enough to allow a sense of real civic responsibility to everyone. In what spheres to-day does citizenship mean something?"

An answer to that perennial question is being discovered to-day in what is called, rather loosely perhaps, community.

A survey of the post-war experiments in community living reveals the fact that nearly all originated out of a sense of frustration experienced by ordinary men and women. " The life of integrity, wherein a man's work and his leisure are of a piece, is all but impossible to lead in the last phases of a competitive and profit-making society."[1] Here is the justification of community: if it is not possible for Christians to live in fellowship one with another within the present ordering of society, then clearly some other means of establishing that fellowship must be sought. For as Canon Raven writes in *The Gospel and the Church*: " There is no need to stress the plain fact that there is, strictly speaking, no such thing as individual salvation, that ' agape ' implies ' koinonia ' (p. 131)." If the Church can offer only personal religion—which of course is a contradiction in terms—then non-conformists must find *koinonia* outside the Church.

There are two major criticisms levelled against community: first, in what way can those who disassociate themselves from the outside world assist in the creation of what they profess to desire, a world in which citizenship means something ? And, secondly, can any such disassociation be without compromise ? Now it has never been contended by any of those who have made this experiment that it offers a solution to the problems of " politics ". It cannot be, in the nature of things, more than an interim measure, necessary until such a time as it becomes possible to live the life of integrity within the social order. It does not pretend to offer anything but an example of what ought to be. The monasteries in the Dark Ages did not pretend to offer a solution to the problem of politics; yet they preserved culture precisely by reason of their disassociation from politics. Their justification to a large extent disappeared when *koinonia* once again became possible outside their walls. " It is to be conceived," writes Middleton Murry, " rather as a concrete criticism of modern society and as an attempt to establish places of restoration and refuge from its anti-human stresses, than as an alternative form of society which could eventually replace the present form."[2] And again: " There comes a point in world affairs when such a defensive attitude is essential, when to keep a small undamaged light still burning is all that can be demanded of the faithful. Such an attitude is not in the least self-centred,

[1] J. M. Murry, *The Defence of Democracy*, p. 29. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 271.

as it is judged by prevalent world opinion, but it does in effect admit a losing battle in terms of here and now: it is dependent on much longer views, and the modern world insists on quick returns."[1]

As for the second criticism, it is of course perfectly true that compromise is inevitable. The Bruderhof are dependent—too dependent in the view of many—upon outside capital and capital equipment; absolute self-subsistence is an impossibility. Yet it is a perfectly valid rejoinder to hold that relative independence is a possibility, and that it is a great deal more to be desired than the relative dependence of the Christian who remains within the social order. Where there is awareness of compromise, when there is consciousness of tension between what is absolute and what is relative, there will always be men and women of integrity who will narrow the spheres in which such compromise is inevitable until those only remain that are necessary for survival. It can scarcely be denied that compromise is more likely within than without " politics ".

There is a multiplicity of communities in this country, and they fall into several categories of faith and order.[2] But there is one factor common to all—they are seeking to discover the power of agape in *koinonia*. " To use a simple parable, a loaf of bread has more value than a number of grains of corn. But in order to make the loaf, the grains have to sacrifice their individuality—that is, their separate existence—and be ground into flour, which is then mixed with water and baked into bread. The grains are thus fulfilling their highest purpose. So individuals who seek for true community, which is the higher unit, have to undergo the same process spiritually." This illustration of Dr Eberhard Arnold, of the Cotswold Bruderhof, is an expression of what is fundamental to all the self-subsistent colonies, and to many other less detached groups.

Most of the community experiments are self-subsistent colonies, though none of them would maintain that they are wholly independent of the common life. They would appear to have succeeded in their primary objective of creating *koinonia* to a remarkable degree. For example, it is possible within the context of a small and compact society to abolish private property; within the framework

[1] Rosalind Murray, *The Good Pagan's Failure*, pp. 49*f*. [2] See *Community in Britain*, published by the Community Service Committee at Chancton, Dartnell Park, West Byfleet, Surrey.

of a nation that is not possible in the same sense, although interesting experiments of income-pooling have been made—amongst others, by a city group in Birmingham, " The Seventy Circle ", who later became united with the Bruderhof. They came to the conclusion, after considerable experience, that " although the gift of friendship expressed both in material and spiritual assistance was part of any Christian witness, yet these in themselves were not enough ". So the income-pooling and social service group became part of a community.

Naturally there are weaknesses in community. Though the majority are nominally Christian, there is frequently very little conception of worship nor is there appreciation of the necessity of dogma. The Community near Ipswich announces in its constitution that " while believing in the fundamental spirit and ethic of Christianity, we are convinced that the truth behind this cannot be embodied in any doctrine or creed. We wish every individual to approach this in the light of their own experience, the criterion of any faith being the life which emanates from it." The Church is rightly indignant when such nonsense emanates from the pen of Mr H. G. Wells or his disciples; it is not so easy to be glib when people are achieving what we have failed to achieve within the Church.

It is the claim of these self-subsisting colonies that they have established conditions in which " citizenship means something "; to many it seems pure moonshine to make such a claim, for they would contend that the responsibilities of citizenship have been shamefully abrogated rather than made meaningful. Yet the tree is known by its fruit: and community has succeeded in achieving a measure of *koinonia* such as is almost unknown in the parochial life of the Church in England. " We desire community: the Church professes to display and enable it: little groups gathered everywhere sometimes experience foretastes of it: but in public life it is manifestly unattained. We all desire community: the Church professes to display and enable it: and at moments, in acts of worship and at Christmas, a glimpse of its meaning is disclosed. But it is only too evident that its character and the conditions of its attainment are not understood, and that in consequence the emotion which lifts us out of solitariness, unites us in a bond of sympathetic intimacy and inspires us with a wish for fellowship, is transitory and disappointing. Yet Christendom possesses in the records

of the Apostolic Age the example of what community can be and achieve."[1]

What is " its character and the conditions of its attainment "? In these days of judgment, man is slowly learning the meaning of repentance: the crucifixion of humanity is revealing to us the truth that we are all members of one Body. But God's mercy cannot break through the process of judgment until penitence is being realized in the realm of action; and for Christians that must mean a far more intensive participation in the sufferings of humanity. We are compelled to discover whether this is by the way of community or whether it is still possible outside.

Now it does not seem that we are yet in a position to answer that question; individuals will answer one way or the other according to their assessment of the situation. It is important that each should appreciate the value of the other; but the vindication of the parishes is in the degree to which they achieve that *koinonia* which community has to greater or lesser extent succeeded in achieving. And at the moment it appears that they have no appreciation that such a problem even exists.

An interesting comment is to be found in the experiences of the Community of the Way in the East End of London. This group was born in Bow, and was largely composed of men who had been unemployed for many years, suffering from malnutrition and spiritual degradation. Before long they came to the conclusion that it was not possible to live as a community in the squalid surroundings of the East End. " Could we seek together such a way of life in Bow? No, we thought, not in its entirety. We must move out to the country, near the things created by the hand of God. . . ." But it was not so simple as it seemed. The Community of the Way met with many difficulties: the exchequer was not too full, it was difficult to find a suitable house and locality, and in a short time they returned to Bow. " We decided to try and work out the ideal a little more fully in Bow and with more families before attempting to establish a rural community. Our life here we hope will embody all the original ideals, with certain modifications. For instance, we shall not all be living under the same roof, nor can we share a common purse, though it may be possible to work out this ideal as a group later."

[1] C. E. Raven, *op. cit.*, p. 249.

This is but one amongst a considerable number of communities which is attempting to work out the implications of *koinonia* within society. How far is this possible within the framework of our existing parochial system? It appears to be the experience of a large number of the clergy that the churchman of to-day has no appreciation whatsoever of the all-inclusive demands made upon him by membership in the Church of Christ. It is high time that we had the courage to proclaim that it is not enough for " the faithful " that they be present at the Mass on Sundays and attend a Guild meeting once a month. What would the early Christians say if they heard us congratulating ourselves that we met for one evening every week for prayer (and gossip), as well as on Sundays? We have no conception of the magnitude of our responsibilities, far less any realization that to be a member of the Church of Christ means that all our time and all our wealth and all our capacities must be devoted toward the single end of establishing God's Kingdom.

The conditions of attainment—what are they? Self-transcendence and discipline—we have to learn to live for the community, and we can only learn to do that by hard-and-fast rules. If Christians are to realize *koinonia* amongst themselves, I believe the first thing that we have to learn is how to use our time; and, furthermore, that cells cannot be content with meeting once or twice a week, but must come together every day in worship—either at the Mass or for prayers at some convenient hour—and perhaps every other day, for the labour of learning to be good evangelists. Rules concerning prayer are simple to make, difficult to keep. But it is also of singular importance that study—of the Bible, the Creeds, and Church history—should be included in the rule. Individuals should specialize according to their capacities; for example, it is the responsibility of the Christian politician to be also an economist. There is, however, a danger that such cells will spend all their time in prayer, study, and evangelism, without learning to know one another; it is very necessary to provide opportunities for purely social intercourse, so that each member of the body is all the time conscious of the function and activities of the other members.

There are, of course, two criticisms which will be levelled against such a statement. How can a mother leave her children to get their own breakfast every morning, or to

put themselves to bed—or is it shelter?—at night? The answer is that she cannot and ought not. But there are a vast number of people who could find the time, but are not sufficiently converted to wish to do so. That, again, may not be wholly their fault, but the argument that there is no time cannot be considered for one moment, when the cinemas and dance halls are packed night after night. Is God more important than Mammon, or is He not? If the Church really believes it wrong to ask its members to devote six nights a week to God and one to pleasure, then let it say so. For the time being acquiescence implies approval.

The second criticism concerns study. We are reminded that the school-leaving age is still fourteen, and that very few adults are capable of understanding theology. If the mind is allowed to stagnate between fourteen and thirty, then such a generalization may be true enough, but why not see that it is not allowed to stagnate between those ages? Theology need not be unintelligible; of what use is the Bible if it is not taught? God gave us minds as well as bodies; if it is wrong for the body to stagnate through malnutrition, it is wrong for the mind to stagnate through a similar frustration. There are degrees of intelligence, but it is blasphemy against God's creation that we should consider the mind incapable of development after the age of fourteen.

So much for the use of time. Equally important is the use of our wealth—money, property, possessions. Many interesting experiments have been made in the pooling of incomes, and much can be done in this direction by single men and women with no dependents; for example, groups of workers in factory or trade, students and school teachers, and certainly clergy. When some members of a cell have dependents it is not so easy. But even in such cases—and they are probably a majority—it has been found possible in some instances to pool all surplus income after necessary expenses have been met. Surplus income would include all that is normally spent on unnecessary goods and services. There are many good reasons why Christians should be more conscious to-day of what they do with their money: but it is not unlikely that in the near future the endowments of the Church will be so reduced as to render well-nigh impossible—under present conditions—the continuation of the work of our Home and Overseas Missions. For such an eventuality we must be prepared; in the meantime we cannot hope for economic reforms either in Church or State until

such groups as we envisage reveal both thrift and discrimination in their own expenditure.

It is along such lines that the Church must plan for the future. When and where these and complementary conditions are fulfilled *koinonia* will develop, not until. If the conditions seem too exacting, then I cannot see what answer we can give to Iona, the Bruderhof, the Franciscans, and their several counterparts; for we shall be acknowledging that within this rotting social system the life of integrity is no longer possible. That would be a terrible conclusion, and there are not wanting signs that the Church is awaking both to the nature of the task and the means by which it may be tackled. For the present we must preach *agape*, practise it ourselves in *koinonia*, and by preaching the gospel of repentance, bring others to realize it too. Not until we are doing these things is there any likelihood that society itself may be changed, the evil spirits exorcized.

Derek M. P. Tasker.

The Parliamentary Oath

A new Member of either House of Parliament is not qualified to sit and vote until he has taken and subscribed the oath required by law. It must be done in a full House and with the Speaker in the Chair. That formality is of the kind which takes us at once into that dangerous but fascinating region where religion and politics, ethics and jurisprudence, meet—as allies or as enemies. The present formula, so simple and concise, does in fact embody a whole phase of our political evolution—namely, the transition from the medieval and Calvinist theocracy to the modern " mechanical " State; the modern Englishman accepts without question the Cromwellian dictum that the State, in choosing men to serve it, takes no account of their opinions on matters touching religion. The dogmatist and the authoritarian (Papalist or Marxian or Hitlerian) may talk harshly of the modern multiform parliamentary State which in this country came to birth in and through the ecclesiastical and constitutional controversies between 1829 and 1888, but we shall be wise not to forget that the vast majority of English people, whatever their ecclesiastical or political allegiance, remain satisfied with the general outline of a

State which is also a community—a *communitas communitatum* whereof the basis is equality, the atmosphere tolerance, the polestar charity. (For those august and lovely public virtues are what the Englishman really signifies when he repeats his favourite formula, Live and let live.) And the concise formula of the Parliamentary Oath is a summary and symbol of that English way of life for the preservation of which we are once more a nation in arms. It is a relic which, unlike some other relics, is no dry antiquarian bone, but one which has in it still the breath of life. Hence this brief note on such a topic in a journal of theology. For if theology is the queen of the sciences, her frontier does not end where the science of politics begins.

I

In this particular instance of civil disability the British Parliament has moved through three stages: of exclusion, of partial toleration, of full and complete freedom. In the course of the two latter movements the constituencies have achieved the right to elect, and the House of Commons has ceased to claim to exclude, Quakers and other minor sectaries, Roman Catholics, Jews, and finally the secularist and avowed atheist. The story begins where most of these politico-ecclesiastical problems begin—with their supposed "settlement" *temp.* Queen Elizabeth. The swearing-in of Members began (in the old Court of Requests) with the oath of *Supremacy—i.e.*, the repudiation of any foreign ecclesiastical or other jurisdiction, enjoined on knights and burgesses by 5 Eliz., c. 1. The oath of *Allegiance—i.e.*, a declaration of loyalty to the reigning sovereign—was imposed on the same persons by 7 Jac. I, c. 6. Both oaths were required of both Houses by 30 Car. II, c. 2, and also, in addition, a Declaration against Transubstantiation. At the Revolution (1 Will. & Mary, c. 8, and 13 Will. III, c. 6) came the oath of *Abjuration*, directed against any pretensions of the descendants of James II. As this new oath concluded with the formula, "on the true faith of a Christian", it debarred Jews just as the other oaths (and the declaration) stood in the way of the Roman Catholic. The penalty for every vote given before subscription was a fine of £500 and certain civil disabilities.

The reverse process of removal set in with the quieter, less polemical temper induced by the alliance of the Whigs with the House of Hanover. The persecuting policy of the

Tory-Anglican junta which had produced the Occasional Conformity Bill and the Schism Act ended, and the statute book, with various Relief Acts as the milestones, begins to show the way to toleration of diversity in religion among our hereditary and elected legislators. Progress was, however, slow and, save for the important concession by which Quakers were allowed to affirm (8 Geo. I, c. 6), little was done until the Reform Act itself was in sight. Then when " the victor of Waterloo " hauled down his " No surrender " flag and capitulated to Daniel O'Connell and the Catholic Association, the Roman Catholic body (then predominantly lay and secular in its ambitions) was granted seats in the Legislature by the Roman Catholic Relief Act of 1829 (10 Geo. IV, c. 7). The " Protesting Catholic Dissenters " were now on an equality with their fellow-sufferers, the Protestant Nonconformist Dissenters. It should be noted that Protestant Dissenters, as such, had never been expressly excluded from Parliament, though Quakers, Moravians, and some lesser sects suffered from their conscientious objection to any kind of oath-taking. They now found relief by the Quakers and Moravians Act, 1833 (1 & 2 Vic., c. 77), an Act which extended the concession already enjoyed by *bona fide* Quakers; in substitution of an oath was provided a solemn affirmation of loyalty to Crown and Constitution.

Thus at the accession of Queen Victoria there remained two classes of her subjects whose consciences precluded their sitting in Parliament: we may say the theist and the atheist—*i.e.*, the Jew who could not take the formula of abjuration, and the agnostic or atheist for whom the invocation of the Deity was a meaningless and hypocritical formality.

The removal of the Jewish disability was discussed in 1847, when Lord John Russell suggested that Jews, who had already provided the nation with several mayors and many magistrates, might be safely admitted to the House of Commons. The resulting debate is memorable as marking one of the earlier stages of Mr Gladstone's progress towards the Liberal leadership. After painful hesitation he astonished and grieved his father and his Oxford constituents by supporting the Whig Prime Minister. He thought that the Jew was as much entitled as the Unitarian to a seat in the Legislature of a State in which he had already the franchise; Parliament had ceased to be Anglican and must now cease to be Christian—in any exclusive sense. Dr Pusey's horror

at this argument and this vote is well known; he wrote that he would no longer be able to pray for Parliament save only " as apostate and as having prepared by this step for the coming of Antichrist ", and regretting that he had helped to put Mr Gladstone in a position where he could further such tragic work (*Life*, iii, 174). Lord Russell was ahead of opinion and the matter dropped until in 1850-51 it was again brought before the House in the persons of Baron Lionel Rothschild and Mr Alderman Salomons, who on refusal to swear " on the true faith of a Christian " were declared incapable of sitting. A promise, however, was given that the matter should receive further attention, and eventually, in 1858, two Acts opened a political career to a Jew of British nationality (21 & 22 Vic., cc. 48, 49). By the first the three oaths (of allegiance, supremacy, and abjuration) were abandoned in favour of one short and simple oath; by the second the House was empowered to omit the words above quoted in the case of individual Jews—a concession made permanent by a Standing Order in 1860. The Parliamentary Oaths Act of 1866 (29 Vic., c. 19) prescribed a form of oath omitting the Christian invocation and also permitting a person legally entitled to affirm in a court of law to enjoy that relaxation on his election to the House. Two years later the Promissory Oaths Act (31 & 32 Vic., c. 72) further shortened the formula, which emerged after these long debates thus:

> I, ..., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Victoria, her heirs and successors according to law. So help me, God.

Thus the British Parliament was now so thoroughly comprehensive that only the conscientious atheist or sincere agnostic was debarred from exercising the legislative responsibilities which birth or election had brought upon him. One may add that no trouble need arise unless to sincerity there was added a strong tinge of polemical pedantry; the oath might well be, and commonly was, regarded as a civil act, not a confession of faith; militant " free-thinkers " had often taken the oath in the courts and " the saint of rationalism ", John Stuart Mill himself, had taken the Parliamentary Oath on his election in 1865. As Archbishop Magee quite rightly said, the oath was never meant to exclude atheists, for no atheist had ever refused to take it; its reference was dynastic, not religious.

II

The miserable controversy of which Charles Bradlaugh was the storm centre is worth annotation on two counts: it was a determining point in our constitutional struggle by which in the end the rights of the constituencies were preserved against the dogged prejudice of a section of the House of Commons; and it exhibits in action the greatest political mind of the Victorian Age. In other words, *l'affaire Bradlaugh* exhibits Mr Gladstone at his best and the House at its worst—and that of both is saying a good deal. The interminable evolutions of this episode may be studied at length in Bradlaugh's biography. Mr J. M. Robertson's mere chronological summary of the proceedings in Parliament, in law court, and constituency, occupies some six pages: the first date, April 2, 1880, is that of the election of Bradlaugh for Northampton; the last, January 27, 1891, is the day when, with Bradlaugh on his death-bed, the House resolved to expunge from its Journal the resolution excluding him which it had passed " amid ecstatic transports " ten years before. Morley's short and dispassionate account of the episode (*Life of Gladstone*, Bk VIII, ch. ii) sets the affair as it should properly be seen—as one irritating and peculiarly exasperating piece of ill-luck among many which befell Mr Gladstone's second Ministry. It should be read, not only as the recital by one secularist of the adventures which befell another in conflict with the forces of Parliamentary stupidity and bigotry and of the lamentable depths to which honest religiosity may lead a public assembly, but also by reason of that easy mastery of the English tongue and that sure instinct for the high lights of his narrative which make Morley one of the greatest of English biographers.

It is an eloquent chapter, for it is buttressed with excerpts from the speeches of the greatest orator of his day. Morley, for instance, prints that part of Mr Gladstone's speech on the abortive Affirmation Bill of 1883 in which he demolishes the theory of a purely " abstract " admission of the Deity and the absurdity of trying to conserve so worthless an admission by the device of a public oath. In that speech there occurred the quotation from Lucretius to which, as Morley well remembered, the House listened " with reverential stillness ". Here was Mr Gladstone " at his sincerest and highest ", treating of those high themes of faith and freedom and truth among which his

mind habitually moved. "Truth," he said as he ended, "is the expression of the Divine Mind; and however little our feeble vision may be able to discern the means by which God will provide for its preservation, we may leave the matter in His hands and we may be quite sure that a firm and courageous application of every principle of justice and of equity is the best method we can adopt for the preservation and influence of truth." This unfortunately was too austere doctrine, and that relieving Bill was lost by a majority of three; some Nonconformists whose own fetters had been not long struck off opposed, while Manning hotly declaimed against allowing a seat in the Legislature to a man who denied the existence of God. An undignified and demoralizing conflict continued: Bradlaugh presenting himself to take the oath, the protagonists of piety and public morality passing resolutions of exclusion by larger majorities. A new writ was issued, Bradlaugh was again elected, only to be once more barred by a new resolution. Meanwhile in the courts of law he was embarked on a suit against the Sergeant of the House, and was himself the defendant in an action for illegally taking the oath. Then came the General Election of November, 1885; again Bradlaugh was returned, and this time the new Speaker, Peel, disregarding the objections of the Conservative leaders, declined to allow any further impediment. Bradlaugh took the oath, became a useful and knowledgeable Member, and three years later introduced a General Affirmation Bill which reached the statute book (The Oaths Act, 51 & 52 Vic., c. 46).

There is an epilogue, in two parts, which should be chronicled in that it does something to rehabilitate the reputation of the House. First, as Bradlaugh lay dying the House, on January 27, 1891, struck out from its Journal the excluding resolution of June 22, 1880, a Resolution which, in the opinion of the mover of the amending resolution, was "subversive of the rights of the whole body of the electors of this kingdom" (Parl. Deb., 349, cols. 1158-74). There was still opposition—from the Solicitor-General, Sir Edw. Clarke, and from the redoubtable Mr de Lisle (Mid. Leics.), who saw in the new resolution an attempt to legalize atheism and to abolish the Decalogue. Mr Gladstone welcomed this belated restitution; the moral he drew was that the resolution of 1880 was an example of "the most dangerous error: the error, namely, of this House exceeding its own jurisdiction". It was, moreover, most ungenerous

of the House to take advantage of Mr Bradlaugh's own ingenuousness in volunteering his opinions so freely. " In the light of the golden distance we must feel that that was a proceeding open to correction ", and the present resolution was therefore no " gratuitous flourish ".

Finally, a week later—it was by chance the day, February 4, 1891, when a new writ for Northampton was issued, " *v.* Charles Bradlaugh, Esquire, deceased "—Mr Gladstone moved the Second Reading of his own Religious Disabilities Removal Bill (Parl. Deb., 349, cols. 1733-99). Its particular object was limited: to permit a Roman Catholic to occupy the offices of Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland and Lord Chancellor of England, disabilities which had survived the Relief Act of 1829, and, in the opinion of good lawyers, the abolition of the Test Act in 1863. Probably one motive in the mind of the introducer of this Bill was to demonstrate that his strictures on " Vaticanism " had not impaired his sense of justice towards the Roman Catholics of this country. Mr Gladstone's speech on this occasion (but how often does the comment flow from the pen !) is one of his best—full of careful historical argument, forceful, even fiery, yet not lacking wit and irony. The Lord Chancellor may now (since 1869) be a Jew, a Hindoo, a Buddhist, a secularist, agnostic, atheist, " but the successors of Pascal, of Thomas à Kempis, of old Pope Gregory the Great, who sent missionaries to the southern part of this country "—they are all disabled. This is political proscription, and " causeless proscription is persecution ". People have asked him if he can be a Christian. " Yes, sir, I can, I will, and I am in proposing this Bill. We ought to do it because we are Christians. There is nothing more fatal to the interests of religious belief than the setting of fictitious, unreal, sham standards of belief." There followed the reference to Bradlaugh which Morley prints—to that " distinguished man and admirable Member of this House, laid yesterday in his mother earth ". The House rejoices at the reparation done within this week to his memory. " But does anybody who hears me believe that that controversy, so prosecuted and so abandoned, was beneficial to the Christian religion . . . that religion which the vast bulk of us believe to be holy, believe to be the greatest and only true treasure of mankind ?"

To that question the House would presumably have answered " No." Unfortunately its act of reparation to

Bradlaugh's memory did not connote any readiness to respond to Gladstone's appeal to round off the process of the removal of religious disabilities. The Leader of the House (Mr W. H. Smith) detected some deep design to further the discredited cause of Irish Home Rule; other eminent speakers on the Government side scented various dangers to the Constitution in the proposal to allow a Roman Catholic to become Lord Chancellor of England; Colonel Sandys (S.W. Lancs.) was worried about the Chancellor's ecclesiastical patronage—twelve canonries and over six hundred benefices—and quoted selected passages from Gladstone's Vatican pamphlets. The Member for E. Fife (Mr H. H. Asquith) remarked that the King's conscience might already rest in the keeping of a Jew, a Nonconformist or an agnostic; why not of a Roman Catholic? He had not, he said, expected to see the ghosts of antique tyrannies stalking down the floor of the House of Commons in broad daylight. Nevertheless, the Bill was lost by thirty-two votes.

W. G. C. Addison.

The Religious Short Story

The short story is at once the oldest and the youngest form of literature. It is the oldest because there never was a time, since the dawn of human light, when folk did not sit round the proverbial fire and tell one another stories—stories which often passed down from mouth to mouth until they received their baptism in ink; and it is the youngest because only within living memory has the short story developed into an art form intended to rival greater forms of literature. We all know that Æsop, Apuleius, Chaucer, Cervantes, Boccaccio, Hoffmann, Defoe, Voltaire, and Tolstoy told tales—larger or smaller pieces that are among the world's masterpieces; but Tchekov, Maupassant, Ernest Hemingway, and D. H. Lawrence have deliberately cultivated the short story as a means of expressing their philosophy. It might almost be said that until recent years the short story had been an accident in literature—something instinctive and spontaneous that has suddenly become objectified into a new form of art with its own glory, its own technique, and its own particular masters.

Now there is an odd little corner of the world's literature which has been devoted to the religious short story—or

perhaps I should say, rather, of short stories that have been devoted to religion—very small, and nowhere does it boast a tradition or claim to have founded a school of thought; but there it is—something that is at once the product of a growing religious consciousness and a register of the point to which that religious consciousness has developed. For the religious short story at its best differs from other short stories only in the fact that, instead of being about love, war, adventure, or whatnot, it is about religion; and it is vulnerable to all the racial shafts and historical accidents of all other short stories. This applies particularly to those ancient sagas and folk-tales in which the world abounds—that have but gradually passed into the highly artificial product of to-day.

The Old Testament is full of them, whether we consider those early pages in *Genesis*, that shadowy masterpiece, *The Book of Esther*, or the great and little tragedies of human domesticity as revealed in *Ruth*. We can see in the development of the Biblical story, from its birth in *Genesis* to its ripe fulfilment in *The Prodigal Son*, a development that is literary as well as religious—a change from the folk-story which is redolent of Oriental characteristics, through crime and passion, exile and heroism, to a universal sense of God's righteousness and man's destiny. The stories of ancient Greece and Rome develop their own particular characteristics, their own philosophy of the universe; but the Jewish short story transcends them both in one particular—its recognition of man's inner conflict and attempt to solve it upon a supernatural plane. That is the vital contribution of Hebrew literature to the story of man. There are, however, stories in the *Gesta Romanorum*, *The Chronicle of the Cid*, and the *Niebelungen* that might have come straight out of the Old Testament. This, I do not doubt, is because Europe was, as Israel had been, groping its way through wars and pestilences and blasts from the Hand of Heaven to a truer conception of God.

The search for the Grail—that haunting melody of Middle Europe—is one that has never quite died out; but I think that the legend of *Faust* is a human drama of greater importance. For here we have something more than romance—the elements of philosophy; and in the dilemma of the German doctor we see bursting into literary form the very spirit of the Renaissance—man's sense of his own faculties and opportunities and the dilemma of Good and Evil into

which this plunges him. *Faust* came from Germany, truly enough; but a while before Goethe had dramatized its theme into an epic, or even Marlowe had adapted it for the English stage, it had appeared as a still small voice in the turbulent storm of the German Reformation. *The Chapbook of Dr Faust* was, in fact, a curious patchwork of genuine folk-tales and demonological legend that contained some gold amid the dross, gold which was finally minted into some of the finest drama that the human mind has yet devised; and there are not wanting some quite new stories of Europe and America which exhibit the *Faust* touch.

This ability of the short story to propagate itself in various forms of literature brings us once again to the Bible, that treasure-house of our language and home of Christian thought; and even a glance at its literary content must, I think, convince us of its tremendous influence upon the mind of modern Europe, particularly since its rebirth into a multitude of modern languages at the Reformation. The story of Ahab and Jezebel—that everlasting tale of the weak man at the mercy of a scheming woman—has again and again formed the essence of some mighty tragedy, of which I suppose *Macbeth* is the mightiest. Then the story of Joseph and his brothers has reappeared in many forms—those baking deserts and the barbaric splendours of Egyptian life transformed into the horrors and wonders of the modern world—while it would hardly be unfair to describe the story of *Esther* as an early attempt at the modern thriller.

It is, however, in the parables of the New Testament that the story achieves its ripest literary glory. They are masterpieces of the short story in structure, characterization, development of idea and human understanding. Take, for instance, the parable of the Prodigal Son. It is not much more than a thousand words—about as much as would fill a column in *The Times*; but it contains a microscopic panorama of human life. Not only are its three characters the three types who people the world; but no single emotion known to the heart of man is omitted from it. All find some corner in it—love, hatred, anger, remorse, jealousy, pity, joy, and irony. It is a perfect epitome of family existence, and its dramatic effect is greatly intensified by its perfect structure—development, climax and coda all playing their part.

Never do the parables of the New Testament for one

moment lose their literary value because of their religious import. The emotional balance is perfect, the poise unshaken; and of how many stories of social life of a romantic type can this be said? It has almost become a truism that whole tracts of Charles Dickens' novels were ruined by the deliberate propagation of ideas. For the short story simply will not become a medium for propagating ideas. It is a far too sensitive plant; and where this cultivation has been attempted, as in Russia and Italy, an early blight has set in which threatens to destroy the crop. The modern short story has become a medium for thought almost as much as for action. It might be said that the stories of Anton Tchekov are more about thought than about action. Maupassant, of course, is sometimes extenuated (as are Thomas Hardy and D. H. Lawrence of quite other kinds); but the pulse of action in Maupassant is the heart beat of France as that in Tchekov is of the slow patience, the rotting disintegrating of old Russia. It is not difficult to understand why America has become the home of literary experiment. A cosmopolitan population, a lack of tradition and a laudable desire to create one, as well as the strong pioneering instinct in the blood of American peoples, all contribute to this; but it is more astonishing that such experiments should flower into a kind of religious renaissance in literature. The movement is a small one, occupying one corner of recent American literature; but it is there. Even the pilgrimage of *Jurgen*, which created a mild flutter in the dovecotes of two continents in the years which followed the last war, was an ironic flight into religious controversy; but stranger things have happened since then. *The Bridge of San Luis Rey* was almost as much a contribution to Christian ethics as to creative literature. It was the story of five people who met their death upon a certain bridge at a particular moment owing to its collapse, a story in which Mr Thornton Wilder endeavoured to disclose the hand of God by retracing the lives of these five individuals in order to reveal a purpose in their end.

The short story has, of course, played a vital part in moulding American literature. It would be no exaggeration to say that the names of Washington Irving, Bret Harte, O. Henry, and Edgar Allan Poe are more celebrated in the short story than in any other kind of literature; that, in fact, America can rival France and Russia in this art, although her short stories lack the prodigality of the one

and the bleak realism of the other. It is not surprising, however, that the new "morality" story should have flowered in a soil such as the American—a soil that is fresh enough and strong enough and rich enough to bring forth fruit, and has had no time in which to become sterile through neglect or hard-baked by a tradition that withers up originality.

The latest fruit of this minor revival in religious literature is, I suppose, Mr Ben Hecht's *Book of Miracles*. Here is something really new, something that puts parody amid the people of God, making of our shoddy little world a workshop for angels rather than a life-dealing and a death-dealing universe on its own. It is an attempt to use the miracles of religion as material for the human story, an essence that is at once a vindication of God and a parody of His human creatures. It has already disturbed that body of *bourgeois* readers who dwell on the fringe of both worlds—the religious and the artistic—without understanding either well enough to see how both may be coalesced in a work that is at once religious and artistic; but these delicately contrived, deliberated pieces have a message for a world that must be neglected at our peril. For it is at once a rebuke to our sterility and a test of our religious nerve.

Too much, I think, has already been written on the power of the short story to portray, as nothing else quite does, the heart-beat of a nation or an age. The Bible is, as we have already seen, the supreme example of this. Tolstoy's *The Long Exile*, Irving's *Rip Van Winkle*, Maupassant's *Boule de Suife*, and the Book of Ruth may give us a glimpse of life upon a national scale, epic and microscopic at the same moment; but none of them, not even *Ruth*, plumbs human depths. For these stories divide humanity; they do not unite it. It is in such a momentary masterpiece as *The Prodigal Son* that we see how all the peoples of the earth can be reduced to the dimensions of a single family, and all ages to a little span of years.

Ashley Sampson.

MISCELLANEA

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

Mr Lampert is a graduate of the Russian Theological Academy in Paris; he is at present working in connexion with the Study-centre of the Fellowship of St Alban and St Sergius at Hertford.

The Rev. Derek Tasker is an Assistant Curate of St Mary, Redcliffe, Bristol.

The Rev. W. G. C. Addison is Vicar of Britford, Salisbury.

Mr Sampson is an Assistant Master at Lawrence House School, St Anne's-on-Sea.

The Rev. Dr Mozley is a Canon of St Paul's.

REVISED REVIEWS—III

THE PERSON AND PLACE OF JESUS CHRIST. By P. T. Forsyth.

The publication in 1907 of the Rev. R. J. Campbell's book, *The New Theology*, was responsible for a convulsion, if not for a crisis, in English Congregationalism. Of all the English Free Churches, the Congregationalists stood most clearly in the tradition of a liberal orthodoxy. That was where Dale had stood in the past; along those lines Dr A. M. Fairbairn, great both in academic learning and in force of personality, guided Mansfield College. It was the historic Gospel, apart from which the titles "Evangelical" and "Catholic" were mere empty names, that they proclaimed. It was a tradition in which an attitude of independence in respect of the forms of the ancient Creeds and of the authority accorded to them in other quarters implied no dissent from their substance. As to the Bible, the main positions of the Higher Criticism were affirmed without let or hindrance by such scholars as Dr Adeney and Dr Bennett, but also without any tendency to follow the theological leading of the German liberals.

The acuteness of the controversy that followed the appearance of Mr Campbell's book was due to the theological and ecclesiastical issues that seemed to be involved. The theology was, so its assailants claimed, incompatible with a definitely Christian theism, incompatible also with that gospel of the Person and work of Christ to which the Congregationalist Churches were committed. And, however greatly prized was the liberty of a particular Church, it was a question of real moment how far it was tolerable that the minister of such a Church should be recognized as within the borders of the Congregationalist Union, if in his preaching and writing he set forth as an authentic account of the Christian religion what the great majority of

ministers and members would regard as not properly Christian, and as breaking with that Gospel which from their earliest days the Congregationalist Churches had affirmed. Those Churches had, doubtless, not been champions of orthodoxy after the mode of historic Catholicism; but in so far as orthodoxy meant loyalty to the Apostolic preaching, and to the religious tradition enshrined in the New Testament and carried on through the centuries and reaffirmed on both sides of the Reformation cleavage, the Congregationalist Churches were unquestionably orthodox before they were liberal. Would they continue to be so if they found the truth of Christianity in Mr Campbell's New Theology?

With a judgment upon Mr Campbell's book, with the rights and wrongs of a controversy often tense and sometimes bitter, and especially with the ecclesiastical problem, we need not further concern ourselves. So much has been said, because it is against the background of an event that deeply stirred religious thought and feeling, without as well as within the borders of Congregationalism, that the man and the book to whom this article is devoted may best be understood. For if in 1907 anyone competent to give an opinion had been asked to name the theologian whose position, teaching, and influence were most directly and comprehensively opposed to the doctrines of the New Theology, he could hardly have failed to answer, "Dr Forsyth."

Forsyth had been Principal of Hackney College since 1901. He had gone there after two remarkable ministries at Leicester and at Cambridge. His university training had been at Aberdeen; his interests were wide—art, philosophy, and politics all made their appeal to him and found in him the capacities both of a student and of an expositor. He had much of the humanist in him; his natural bent was in the direction of a liberalism that did not cease to influence him when he came to the consideration of Biblical and theological questions. But this attitude of mind, though he never became a stranger to it, was profoundly affected, and, as a guide to life and thought, set aside, by what some might call a discovery, but he did call the revelation of the holiness and grace of God. The classic passage bearing on this occurs in his Yale Lectures, published in 1906 under the title *Positive Preaching and Modern Mind*. It looks back many years and shows how, through a personal experience (of which he has not much to say, but all that he says is impressive and illuminating), he came to a new mind concerning religion and theology. He had not ceased to be a liberal so far as scientific method and technique went; but the kind of religious liberalism that was essentially humanitarian in its starting-point and its goal had no further hold upon him. In particular, the "liberal-picture" of Jesus appeared to him as, if not simply a caricature, yet superficial and unsatisfying. It did no justice

to the central position of the Cross in Christianity; it formed no true background to the Apostolic preaching; and it did not meet the needs of a soul aroused to a sense of its sin and guilt, and facing those real and final issues whose nature is moral and whose treatment and solution must also be moral.

Forsyth had not published much before 1906. With the Yale Lectures he began a series of notable books in which he expounded the theology of Christianity as, above all, the word of the Cross. Forsyth was not a Biblical scholar, a minute researcher into the meaning of texts, after the manner of Dale, and still more of Denney, who was then at the height of his powers. Nor was his theology systematic as one might apply that word to R. C. Moberly's *Atonement and Personality*. Yet few writers can ever have been less at a loss for what to say in the unfolding of their theme. He had an extraordinarily fertile mind, a style that might be judged at times too eloquent, at times too epigrammatic, but was never flat or dull, and a great power of ranging far afield without ever losing sight or grasp of his centre. In the books and articles of those years there was the proof of a mind of first-rate theological power and insight; there was also the passion (by which I do not mean the violence) of one who believed that it was with no trivialities or matters of degree that contemporary controversy was concerned. All that he hoped for both Church and world was grounded in the Cross of Christ, and he could imagine no greater loss than that the Church should come to glory in something more than in the Cross and to understand it better. So good a thing as zeal for social reform was a peril to the soul of the Church if it was given the first place in the Church's interests. Two of his books of those years are devoted to soteriology, *The Cruciality of the Cross* and *The Work of Christ.*

A few years before Harnack had answered the question, What is Christianity? in a book that bore that title in Engish. To his answer justice has not always been done. He did not expound an ethical theism, with Jesus no more than its highest prophet. Forsyth did not thus misread him. But it is true that Harnack's answer comes short of the New Testament at the criticial point. Jesus was Son of God; so much Harnack would affirm. But if we ask, " What does that mean?" Harnack will not say. Indeed, he more than implies that no one can say. Yet it can hardly be doubted that the New Testament does say, and that the writers believed that in what they said the meaning of the Person of Jesus was finally, unchangeably, given.

It was to this question that Dr Forsyth addressed himself in the Congregational Union Lecture for 1909. He had given the best of his powers to an exposition of Christianity as the religion of redemption owing itself to an historic Redeemer. In doing so he had had much to say about the Person of Christ and the implications of Christian faith in Him. But he had not pre-

sented his belief explicitly as a theology in which justice was done, or at least attempted, to the historic faith of the Church that Christ was true God and true man.

The " scheme " of the book suggests operations of a military character, arising from a consciousness of an objective that needs to be captured, while that objective is no foreign citadel but the stronghold of Christian faith. The four main divisions are headed, " Reveille and Password ", " Reconnaissance ", " The Advance ", and " The Advance in Force ". An outline of the difference between a lay religion that tends to repudiate not only sacerdotal conceptions but " theological ", and especially " atoning religion ", and the Apostolic religion of the New Testament leads on to a yet deeper distinction between " the religion of Jesus " as some would expound it, with the stress laid upon His personal piety and experience, and " the Gospel of Christ ", wherein He is presented as the object of faith. Forsyth's conclusion is that " we come, then, to our communion with God, not along with Christ, and in like fashion with Christ, but *through* Christ and *in* Him ". On the purely scientific side of New Testament exposition he drew upon the work of the " Religious-Historical School ", then coming much to the front, which, with whatever dissent from the faith of the Church, was affirming that " as far back as we can go we find only the belief and worship of a risen, redeeming, and glorified Christ ". The next chapter brings us face to face with interpretations, with the Socinian idea of Christ as the perfect prophet, with the Arian conception of Him as God's plenipotentiary, and with the Athanasian answer that in Christ we have God's real presence. Only the last is consonant with Christ's " sense of finality ". The argument now advances along two parallels. Four lectures are devoted to a survey of the results that follow when the nature of Christ's self-consciousness is considered, when the testimony of Apostolic experience, in general and in particular, is examined, and when we investigate the witness of the Christian soul and the Christian Church. All the results are shown to converge on an affirmation of Christ's finality, of His divine sonship and saving power in His Cross, and of an Apostolic interpretation in which something much more than the inspiration of individuals is to be seen. Along the second parallel the thought moves to an exposition of " the moralizing of dogma ", illustrated first by the meaning of the Omnipotence of God, and then by that of the Absoluteness of Christ. The presentation of the ethical character and bearing of Christian truth was a task in which Forsyth delighted. He was no anti-intellectualist; it would have been absurd to suggest that he was an irrationalist; but Kant and Butler meant more to him than the speculative philosophers. Two sentences which come in the approach to his explicit statement of Christology are specially relevant: " The Incarnation, being for a moral and not a metaphysical purpose,

must be in its nature moral. Its metaphysic should therefore be a metaphysic of ethics, and not of thought as pure being."

So, finally, to the concluding and deeply theological chapters on "The Pre-existence of Christ", "The Kenosis or Self-Emptying of Christ", and "The Plerosis or the Self-Fulfilment of Christ". Whereof it may be said that a strict exponent of Patristic orthodoxy would find some things unacceptable, such as the repudiation of the doctrine of the two wills (the two natures doctrine is not abandoned in so many words, though clearly uncongenial) and the definite admission of "ignorance and limitations in Christ", of "errors in respect of the form of the future no less than the history of the past, which He shared with His time and race". But the upholder of Patristic doctrine would also find the substance and reality of that orthodoxy in respect of the unity of Christ's Person and the truth of His deity and humanity, so that He, the one Person, is both God and man, vividly present and alive in these pages. Here are no dry bones nor anything like them. This is a Christology which speaks to the mind and to the heart; it does justice to the human interests of ancient Antiochenes and modern Liberals, for this Christ grew and learnt and experienced and struggled according to the full measure of His manhood; it does justice also to the Church's confession of the Eternal Sonship, of that act—Forsyth would say that profoundly moral act—whereby the Father gave and the Son came, an act of "premundane renunciation". And I know few, if any, pages in modern theology that bear a finer witness to a Christian theologian facing and answering to the best of his ability, scientific and Christian, a question that continually challenges men to make up their minds than those in which Forsyth speaks of the union of God and man in Christ. No single quotation can be satisfactory; yet only by some quotation can I make the lines along which his thought moves in any way clear. What follows is, at least, characteristic:

> In Christ we have two things, the two grand actions of spiritual being, in final peace and eternal power. We have the whole perfect action of Godhead concentrated through one factor or hypothesis within it and directed manward both to create and redeem; and we have also the growing moral appropriation by man's soul moving Godward of that action as its own, as its initial divine nature and content. In Christ's life and work we have that divine mobility in which the living Son eternally was—we have that coming historically, and psychologically, and ethically to be. He came to be what He always vitally was by what I have called a process of moral reintegration. He moved by His history *to* a supernal world that He moved *in* by His nature.

No one, not even Athanasius, is more impressive than Forsyth in his fundamental faith that none but God can redeem, and that if Christ redeems, as assuredly He does, He is truly God. It is this belief from which he never swerves that keeps the element of restatement in Forsyth's Christology, as seen in his critical

attitude to the form of Chalcedonian orthodoxy, from being the statement of a different Christology.

Forsyth's lectures were given with a particular theological situation and tendency in full view. To that extent they may be said to " date ". But as a Christological enquiry and statement they remain as fresh and relevant as they were when first delivered. Indeed, not infrequently one feels that they " date " only in the sense of looking forwards. The work of Hoskyns, Dodd, and others as interpreters of the Gospel, and especially of the synoptic tradition, had hardly begun when Forsyth died in 1922, yet in this book of many years earlier there are preliminary echoes of the findings which such scholars were to make as to the theology and Christology of that tradition. Again, on the strictly doctrinal side there is much which anticipates the dogmatic of Barth and Brunner in its emphasis upon the holiness and grace of God, on revelation, particularly on the revelation in Christ, and in its aversion from that " undogmatic " Christology which is content to describe Christ as the supreme religious hero or the fairest flower of human development. At the same time, Forsyth leaves on me the impression of holding the doctrines of God and of man in a much truer and better-proportioned relation to one another than does Barth or even Brunner. Forsyth has a real sense of the religious value of man's evolution, history, and progress. He never turned his back on the typical Liberal assertions on these points, however much he felt that they needed modification in the light of another set of truths. But it was not his belief that the human quest for God led to nothing but the setting up of false gods. The doctrine of complete discontinuity between man and God was not his. Of history he says that " its sense of God is not that of subjective immanence, but of living contact with a living spiritual reality ".

A theologian may be learned and weighty, but if he lacks insight he will never attain to the first rank. Insight Forsyth possessed in no common degree, and it is revealed in many a turn of the argument or passing phrase. Thinking both of the greatness and of the limitations of Harnack, and of popular forgetfulness of the latter, he writes: " It really takes a great deal of theology to revolutionize theology." It was no surprise to him that a great disaster should often mean the submerging of an easy optimism by a wave of scepticism and pessimism: " It is the inevitable result of the attempt to measure the whole of anything so spiritual as life or God by its power to satisfy natural expectations." And in all that he writes he shows himself sensitive to the greatness of his subject. He could never walk in the way of a merely facile apologetic. It is " a vast venture and committal . . . when we put our soul in Christ's hands for God and for eternity ". That Christians are disbelieved is no surprise to him: " Christ Himself was disbelieved, and He grows credible but slowly. I cannot claim to have been

freeborn in this faith: with a great price have I procured its freedom. I have envied those who took naturally and sweetly to Christ—though they have helped me little." Only once in this book do I note a definite failure of insight, and that is when he writes in criticism of the " old dogma " of the union of the two natures in Christ, that " they were united into a Person whose action only began after the union, and did not affect it. It began (according to the dogma) in the miraculous conception, which was not an ethical act, rather than in the grace of the eternal Son, who for our sakes, from rich became poor ". But there is no real contrast; according to the old dogma the pre-mundane action of the Son certainly did " affect " the union—though " affect " is a curious word; and outstanding in the Lucan narrative is the ethical act of the faith and obedience of the Blessed Virgin which is integral to the event of the miraculous conception.

At this point Forsyth did not do justice to the old categories; it may be granted that the Chalcedonian doctrine of the two natures with its corollaries did allow of a dangerous over-emphasis upon the simply " physical " side of the union, as though when that is given everything is given. Yet the presence of the love and grace of God in the Incarnation, in that divine purpose which is its heavenly background, in the fact of the birth of the Son into this world, and in the events of the incarnate life, culminating in the Cross, was not forgotten. Forsyth set up too sharp an antithesis and the matter is too important for no reference to be made to it.

But that here is a book which to-day, no less than thirty years ago, illuminates the doctrine of the Person of Jesus Christ—of that I have no doubt whatever. Forsyth had not laboured in vain in his study of the New Testament and of dogmatic theology, in his penetrating survey of the facts of Christian experience and of morality as the soul or substance of things. And this book is witness that what, as he tells us, he would desire above all things to carry to the close of life and beyond, " the acquisition of a real, sure, humble, and grateful faith in the Eternal and Incarnate Son of God ", he had, indeed, acquired; or, rather, into the freedom of that faith he had been brought. It was because of what he was as a believer that he could speak as he did as a theologian.

J. K. Mozley.

STUDIES IN TEXTS

Our holy and our beautiful house, where our fathers praised thee, is burned up with fire : and all our pleasant things are laid waste.—Isa. lxiv. 11.

I. This verse, which comes from " Trito-Isaiah ", is thought to refer to some unknown catastrophe in the history of the Second Temple. There were three Temples.

(*a*) Solomon's Temple was a royal chapel rather than a national sanctuary, a St George's, Windsor, rather than a Westminster Abbey or a St Paul's Cathedral. Jeroboam's revolt shows how little hold it had on the affections of the mass of the Hebrews. It was built with Tyrian help and had various features which were non-Hebrew and by later standards heathen. But by the time it was destroyed in 586 it had acquired prescriptive sanctity, and during the exile its rebuilding was the object of many hopes and plans.

(*b*) The Second Temple was begun in 520 and finished in 516. It was a day of small things, and the impoverished little community, rebuilding after destruction, could afford little in the way of splendour. The ancient men who remembered the former Temple wept for joy when the foundations were laid (Ezra iii, 12). Haggai, whose prophetic zeal inspired the enterprise, promised that the glory of the later house should be greater than that of the former house (ii, 9). Remembering the devotional heights of prayer and praise reached by the worshippers therein, which are exemplified by the prayers found in Chronicles and by the 119th Psalm, we shall conclude that the promise was fulfilled.

(*c*) Herod's Temple was a magnificent building. "Forty and six years was this temple in building" (John ii, 20). The disciples, though they knew it so well, exclaimed as if seeing it for the first time: "See what manner of stones and what buildings!" To which Christ replied: "There shall not be left one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down" (Mark xiii, 1, 2).

II. One by one our holy and beautiful houses of God are being bombed to rubble or burned out. So the attitude of our Lord in view of a similar prospect for "My Father's house" is of great practical importance. Looking at the city from the Mount of Olives, with the Temple dominating the view, He wept over it. Yet He faced the coming destruction with clear eyes. And this although He loved it. "My house shall be called the house of prayer." The Temple was a bank, a fortress, a market; the sacrificial system was approaching its end, but the prayers offered in the Temple sanctified it in His eyes.

Nevertheless the wonderful building was doomed to destruction. "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up. . . . But He spake of the temple of His body" (John ii, 19, 21). In the light of later teaching about the mystical Body of Christ we are justified in seeing here a reference to the Church. It is the living Church, consisting of men and women leading a God-fearing life, in union with one another and with Christ the Head, that matters in His eyes.

III. We do well to grieve over the destruction of monuments of beauty and piety. There is the obvious reflection that the Temple of God, which we are, was for St Paul spiritual, and

was represented outwardly by meetings in upper rooms. Apart from this our grief should be in a measure penitential, in that we cannot replace the lost beauty. Nothing has happened that was not common in the Middle Ages, when our forefathers not only made good the destruction wrought by foes, but deliberately pulled down the existing churches in order to build finer ones. We shall have in days to come such churches as we deserve. At present Church art is largely a branch of archæology, expressing itself largely in "preservation" societies; only to a small extent can we create. Perhaps one reason why God allows the havoc is to give a chance for the sense of beauty to revive and express itself in lovely buildings.

W. K. L. C.

"THE UNIVERSITIES IN TRANSFORMATION"

In the Michaelmas term of 1940 a group of lecturers, administrators, and students of the Durham Colleges in the University of Durham met once a week under the auspices of the Student Christian Movement to discuss various problems connected with the place of the University in the modern world. The result of the discussions was incorporated in a Report which was presented to the Vice-Chancellor at a general meeting of the Durham Colleges Branch of the S.C.M. held in December. Since we finished our discussions, Adolf Löwe's book on *The Universities in Transformation* has appeared, and Canon Raven's subsequent review of it in THEOLOGY for December, 1940, seems to indicate that further contributions to what many people now feel to be an acute and pressing problem might be of interest. The following is an abridged version of the Report of our group, emphasizing the general questions we discussed, rather than the local and particular ones. It will appear that as a group we were not entirely satisfied with the state of the modern Universities, nor with the attitude to University life of the student body as a whole, but that we thought that adaptation rather than revolution was called for. The suggestions put forward represent an attempt to put into practice the realization of what we have considered to be the true aim of University education—the development of personality to the full according to Christian principles.

B. HAMILTON THOMPSON.

REPORT

The group, assuming a Christian basis to its discussions, set out to discover:

A. What Universities stand for to-day.
B. What is the true aim of University education.
C. What changes are needed in order to realize that aim.

A. We first considered the historical development of both the older and newer types of University, and came to the conclusion

that the aim of University education has always been the full development of the individual, though different ideas current at different times have profoundly influenced this aim. The medieval and rennaissance idea of benefiting society by the nurturing of a special category of persons was revolutionized by:

(*a*) The liberal anti-ecclesiastical theories of the nineteenth century.

(*b*) Economic and social factors which have tended to make the University the gateway to earning a living.

It was chiefly in this connexion that we were aware of the difficulty of reconciling the vocational and purely cultural aspects of the University curriculum and realized the problems caused by what Löwe, following Flexner, calls the " social lag " in the University system.

We discussed various external and internal factors which condition life in Universities, old as well as new. With regard to the religious factor, we came to the conclusion that, whether the majority realizes it or not, we are living in a society with a definite bias towards Christian morality and culture, and that, therefore, as any society conditions groups formed within itself, the University is consciously or unconsciously a Christian body, though it is not an organ for the propagation of Christianity in the same way that, for instance, Universities in Germany are now organs for the dissemination of Nazi political doctrines.

Among external factors we particularly realized the importance of the material from which the student body is selected—the effect of secondary education upon the individual, and of national and economic changes in recent years (excluding war conditions) which have influenced the aims of the student class as a whole, and which have turned a degree into a social asset. These latter factors have almost entirely abolished the " finishing school " idea of the University, and have therefore tended to stress its vocational aspect as a training-ground for a definite career.

Among internal factors conditioning University life we noted a lack of feeling of solidarity between dons and students, which is not peculiar to the local conditions with which we were most generally familiar. We thought that this was a real drawback which led to much lack of co-operation and progress, and we thought it was largely due to:

(1) The extension of school influences, which seldom seem to be thoroughly eradicated from the minds of students who come up straight from school (*i.e.*, that the don is there primarily for the purpose of " catching the student out ").

(2) Lack of attempt on each side to understand the ruling aims and aspirations of the other.

B. As a Christian body we were agreed that the worship and service of God is the primary duty of every Christian, and that, therefore, the aim of University life must be so to develop the

personality of the individual that he may best be fitted to perform his duty to God and to society. We realized that Universities are organically related to the society from which they spring and in which they live, for it has very largely conditioned:

(*a*) What they are.

(*b*) What is expected of them.

At the same time they must stand detached, though not aloof from society as a whole, in that their function is to help to clarify thought and to criticize current movements either from within or without. Therefore a student's whole University career, whether it be concerned with some specialized branch of study or a training for a definite profession, should be looked upon as a vocation, and not as a mere short-cut to a profession. The aim of students should be to gain a philosophy of life by:

(*a*) The study of some special branch of knowledge. (N.B.—Specialization must not entail failure to relate this knowledge to life as a whole.)

(*b*) Contact with other people, and with new and possibly conflicting ideas.

C. Before we could begin to be constructive we decided that we must define the purpose of authority in the University. Authority is necessarily conservative, but that does not mean that it is blind to the need for progress. The student population is a changing one—each generation may want to undo the work of its predecessors and begin again. Those in authority, being a more permanent body, have as their purpose the guarding and conserving of what is best (measured by tests of time and experience) for the good of the whole.

A good deal of discussion took place over the need for college discipline. The idea was put forward that such discipline is a necessity, because, by coming to a University, the student voluntarily prolongs that period in his life when he need take little responsibility for himself, a responsibility which he thus delegates to others. The contrary view was also expressed that the student comes to the University to take upon himself the responsibility of governing his own life, and that the latter process can be realized only by complete freedom. Three points seem to be relevant here:

(*a*) That some form of discipline is obviously a necessity in community life unless complete anarchy is to prevail.

(*b*) That the student should not be thought of as an adolescent, but as an adult.

(*c*) That discipline should be founded on a reasonable basis, and that petty rules and restrictions should be carefully avoided.

Setting before us the aim of so developing the individual that he may be best fitted for the art of life, we arrive at the following conclusions:

(*a*) That if the purposes of the University are to be fulfilled in the best way, we must have a much more careful system of

selection from the schools so as to discover those who will benefit most, and that the school curriculum should be deeper in content so as to avoid the dangers of cramming and over-specialization.

(*b*) That a feeling of solidarity between senior and junior members of a University is necessary for the good estate of the whole body. Both the professional and social relationships of dons and students were here discussed.

(*c*) That a good deal might be done to bring students into contact with their work as a reality and with their teachers as personalities, and not mere machines for the dissemination of factual knowledge if—

(1) Examinations were reduced to a minimum.

(2) In Universities where this does not as yet apply, informal discussion between lecturers and students supplemented or partially superseded the lecture system.

(3) Students were everywhere encouraged far more to attend lectures outside those prescribed for their regular course. (Even at Oxford and Cambridge, where this is possible, it is not officially encouraged as a rule.)

[It should be noted that these suggestions are put forward as an attempt to adapt conditions in Universities without altering the traditional form of the specialized Honour Degree courses: changes in the latter were not considered to be within the competence of such a discussion as the present.]

CORRESPONDENCE

THE PRICE OF THEOLOGICAL BOOKS

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

Please may I lodge a mild protest with you against the desire of one of your reviewers in a recent number of THEOLOGY to see a Penguin book issued in a " more durable ", and presumably more expensive, form. Surely what students of theology need very sorely is a general reduction in the price of theological books. Most of us are becoming steadily poorer, and our fortunes are never likely greatly to improve. Few of us can possibly afford to buy new books costing 15s. or more a volume, even when your reviewers tell us that a study of them is essential to an adequate knowledge of the subjects of which they treat.

Prices could be reduced if publishers would abandon the habit of elaborate binding which is now customary, and the text might be printed on cheaper paper. Could the English firms take a hint from the French publishing houses, which issue their books uncut in paper covers? If it be objected that these books

will not stand hard wear, the answer seems to be that readers of theology are mostly mild, harmless men, who do not throw books about the room even when they disagree with the author's opinions. And do we want them to last? Theological works very quickly get out of date.

Alternatively, could theological books not be put on the market at all for private purchase, but be owned collectively by the Church in some way, and be available in sufficient numbers for the use of students? As it is, the libraries do their best, but they do not get many copies of new books, and readers cannot keep them long because of the waiting list. A reader may even have to wait for a book until it has lost much of its immediate interest for the scholarly public. No doubt there are many practical difficulties in the way of collective ownership; but in itself it is eminently Christian, and the practical difficulties ought not to be beyond the Church's administrative genius to solve.

I am,
Yours faithfully,
J. W. Parker.

Woodton Rectory,
Bungay.

[All religious publishers do their best to keep down the price of books, and welcome suggestions to that end.

The particular ones made by Mr Parker have been frequently considered by publishers and rejected. The reduction in price which the suggested savings would effect is almost negligible. I have before me the ledger figures of a book published shortly before the war, of which an edition of 1,500 was printed, the price being 12s. 6d. If really poor paper had been used, £5 would have been saved, representing about 1d. a copy in the cost of production and 3d. in the published price. No book-lover would thank you for a saving of 3d., if it meant that a good book was printed on poor paper.

Binding in paper covers would have meant a saving of 6d. in cost, 1s. 6d. in selling price. A substantial part of the cost has to be met in any case—namely, folding, collating, and stitching the sheets.

For the sake of argument, let us say that the publisher would sell the book for 10s. 6d. instead of 12s. 6d. In practice he would incur a heavy loss. The stock would deteriorate rapidly in his warehouse; the bookseller would not buy a book that was " bad stock "; librarians would ban it and would be justifiably indignant at having to pay at least half a crown for binding a single copy.

Why, it may be asked, does a publisher treble the cost of production?

To answer in terms of percentages: If a book costs 33, the proceeds are normally 100. Allowing for review, author's,

library, and soiled copies, the figure falls to, say, 96. The publisher sells to the bookseller at 64, overseas at 48, to U.S.A. at anything down to 32. Also he gives additional discounts to wholesalers. He cannot reckon on more than 60, averaging the various rates of discount. The author's royalty, let us say 9, is paid on the published price. Publisher's overheads, traveller's commissions, etc., come to at least half of the cost of production, without reckoning advertising in periodicals. If the publisher allotted 5 to this item, he could not hope to satisfy the author.

We have reached these figures:

Cost of production	£33
Overheads	16
Advertising	5
Royalty	9
	£63
Net receipts	£60

And this is based on the supposition that every copy is sold, which is rarely the case. Then how do publishers continue to exist? The continual bankruptcies of firms and their absorption into large combines show that in many cases they do not. It may safely be said that the survivors flourish by reason of a good "back list" of books which go on selling steadily without any effort on the part of the publisher, the profits of which pay his overheads and enable him to finance new ventures.—W. K. Lowther Clarke.]

Editorial Note.—We regret that owing to serious delays in the post the publication of this number has been delayed.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE PUBLIC MINISTRY OF JESUS. By George Ogg. Cambridge University Press. 15s.

It is refreshing to receive so scholarly a book on a technical subject in war-time. Perhaps it is almost too scholarly. It is not necessary to quote other scholars always in the original language. Thus a page is occupied by a chronological summary in German beginning, "Erster Tag in Kapernaum. 1 Tag", and containing lines like "2 Monate 9 Wochen 1 Tag=4¼ Monate". Another half-page of dates gives the years in the "a.u.c." reckoning, which puts needless difficulty in the way of the reader. It is too conscientious to say that a certain calculation is "as Ladeuze justly remarks, 'trop subjectif'"; and certainly undesirable to quote Syriac without transliteration. A famous scholar said to the reviewer: "I have forgotten the Syriac alphabet three times."

The great merit of Dr Ogg's book is the very full setting out of all the available material, with one exception to be noted later. The exhaustive conspectus of all the views held in the early Church is most valuable, though its importance is negative, since apparently the writers had no sources of information other than the books of the New Testament. Even now, in spite of researches into the Jewish Calendar and into astronomical probabilities, the decision as to the length of the Ministry depends mainly on two factors—the meaning of "the fifteenth year of Tiberius" and the importance we attach to the data provided by the gospels of St Mark and St John. Unfortunately neither gives a clear result, though Dr Ogg makes the *prima facie* meaning of the fifteenth year, that it begins with the death of Augustus, seem the most attractive. St Mark's indications are so slight—they amount to no more than a presumption that he refers to three spring seasons (the "ears of corn" of ii, 23, "the green grass" of vi, 39, and the final Passover)—that no certainty can be derived from them. So we are driven to reliance on the chronology of the feasts in St John, which is open to the objections that readings are uncertain and that the evangelist's desire for historical accuracy in these points is not self-evident.

Dr Ogg concludes that we must choose between 30 and 33 for the date of the Crucifixion. The earlier date is ruled out by the Fourth Gospel. It is interesting to note that in 1933 the Roman Catholic Church observed the 1,900th anniversary of the Crucifixion. In so long a book it is surprising that only about one page is devoted to the chronology of St Paul's life,

which to many scholars is with difficulty reconciled with so late a date as 33. But we must not quarrel with a very satisfying book.

W. K. Lowther Clarke.

The Bible in its Ancient and English Versions. Edited by H. Wheeler Robinson. Clarendon Press. 12s. 6d.

The purpose of this book is to supply, within the compass of a single volume of moderate size, a compendious account of the origins and text of the Bible and of the ancient versions of it, followed by a fuller treatment of the various translations of it into English from Anglo-Saxon times to the present day. The scheme is an admirable one; and in the competent hands of Dr Wheeler Robinson as editor and with the assistance of a highly-qualified band of collaborators it has been triumphantly carried into execution. The mass of information that the book contains is enormous, and every serious student of the Bible should rejoice to have it on his shelves. The scholar will welcome it as giving him a conspectus, invaluable for reference, of a subject of which no professional student, however learned in his own branch, can hope to be master in its whole range; while the subject-matter is so clearly and attractively handled that the book can hardly fail to give pleasure to the ordinary educated reader. The latter is likely to find particular interest in Mr Isaacs's two charming and learned chapters on the English versions from the beginning of the sixteenth century up to the appearance of the Revised Version. The many illustrations given of the manner in which the " final music " of the Authorized Version was evolved as " the result of sure instinct working subtly on the vast and various material offered " by its forerunners are particularly fascinating. The Revised Version and the numerous unofficial translations that have appeared in recent years are dealt with by Professor Cadoux. If at times his account is inclined to become a slightly dry catalogue of facts and books, this may be readily forgiven him in view of the vast fund of useful and accurate information that he provides, and his eminently sensible and balanced treatment of the vexed question of the merits and demerits of the Revised Version and other modern translations. Dr Wheeler Robinson himself opens the volume with an excellent chapter on the Hebrew Bible, and brings it to a close with a valuable supplement to its main theme in the shape of a brilliant and deeply suggestive essay on " The Bible as the Word of God ". An ample bibliography is provided for each chapter, and the indexing is on the lavish scale which a book of this kind requires and deserves.

C. S. Phillips.

Saint Thomas Aquinas. By Gerald Vann, O.P. Hague and Gill. 6s.

Generally speaking, man excels in analysis, but the power of synthesis is nearer to divine things. So I translate roughly a phrase of Ernest Hello's, the Breton friend of Léon Bloy's, who revealed to a very high degree the power of intuitive insight. Hello could illuminate territories of human experience with a flash, but he lacked the power of co-ordinating masses of material which nowadays is so common, but not often found together with a high degree of intuitive insight. St Thomas Aquinas was gifted with marvellous power of illuminating whole regions of reality with a single principle. *Bonum gratiæ unius, majus quam bonum naturæ totius universi.* (*Summa Theologica*, 1a-2æ, q. 113, a. 9, ad 2)—*The good of grace in one is greater than the good of nature in the whole universe.* And St Thomas was also gifted to a marvellous degree with the power of synthesis, for which reason he has been called the Genius of Order.

Father Vann has written a book which should help many people to prepare the ground for a study of St Thomas's own writings. The book has been written primarily for non-Catholic readers. Father Vann has drawn on much that recent scholarship has added to our knowledge of the intellectual conflicts of the Middle Ages in order to provide a background for the view that he wishes to bring forward, the view that St Thomas, who was admirably predisposed by birth, natural endowment, training, temperament, and environment to be the mouthpiece for universal truth, has left us a truly remarkable instrument for bringing about the union of intelligences and of hearts. This instrument is Thomism, by which is meant not a mere skeleton preserved on parchment by means of written signs, but a vital intellectual organism " endowed with an infinite capacity for the assimilation of new truth and for adjustment to new conditions and environments, without loss of substantial unity . . . an ultimate synthesis, centred in God, so elemental and so elastic that it could include all future discovery and speculation, and, in so doing, both enrich itself and give unity to all human knowledge, past, present, and future " (quoted, p. 155, from *Scholasticism*, by V. White, O.P., p. 27). It is a merit of Father Vann's highly compressed statement that he supplies all the necessary information for an appreciation of the truth of this view, and in the process recalls all that it is essential to know about the life, the task, the labours, and the achievement of St Thomas. Thus the reader will be able to judge for himself with what good reason so many are now turning for guidance to the thought of the Aquinate.

Very interesting is the theme, running through the whole book, that in St Thomas's doctrine concerning the true order of contemplation and of action, according to which the highest way of life is that in which action overflows from a contemplation

which is itself the gift of God, there may be found the wisdom with which to unravel the enormous riddle which men descry in what divides the Orient and the Occident, and the necessary light for achieving a new synthesis of the best that East and West have to give. Father Vann is concerned here only to stress grounds that make for union, which is a reason for not drawing attention to difficulties that could be discussed only in a lengthy work. On the side of common ground it can be said that Thomism has already provided one worker—M. Olivier Lacombe, author of an admirable book, *L'Absolu selon la Védânta* (Paris: Geuthner, 1937)—with great resources, both technical and intuitive, for the understanding of Indian systems of thought.

In conclusion, this small volume of pleasing appearance contains much matter of interest to the student of St Thomas, and provides a stimulating initiation to St Thomas's work for others, Catholic and non-Catholic alike.

BRIAN COFFEY.

THE CHURCH AND THE WORLD: CHURCH AND SOCIETY IN ENGLAND FROM 1800. Vol. III. By Maurice B. Reckitt. Allen and Unwin. 7s. 6d.

In the *Survey of Books on Christian Doctrine*, which appeared in January, we remarked that, having received the second volume of this trilogy (by C. E. Hudson), it made us buy the first and want the third. Now that desire is satisfied and we have the set complete. This final volume is worthy of its fellows. The scissors-and-paste method is pursued with the same admirable skill, but the field is restricted to our own country in the last 140 years. It is tremendously compressed, and therefore by no means easy to read, but it is even more interesting than the earlier volumes, because it explains men and movements of our own nation and era, and shows us how the present day came to be. The relation between social and Church reform is carefully traced, and in the final chapter an attempt is made to evaluate the period since the first Great War, though, as the author wisely says, " the last twenty years are too near to be truly assessed, and for the significance of what has occurred during this time to be disentangled and precisely estimated ". Following this, an epilogue of some thirty-seven pages deals with the contemporary situation and its problems, and there are appendixes on the Church and the world in the Mission Field, based on material supplied by the Rev. F. W. T. Craske, and The Church and the Education of the People after 1833, by C. K. Francis Brown. Emphatically this is not a book to pick up and dip into when one has a headache, but if and when one girds oneself for the study it deserves, one is almost overwhelmed by its interest and value. All of us who love our Church and our country owe an immense debt to the authors for giving us the

fruit of their labours in these three source-books on Christian sociology. As one lays down the last, one thinks, *How* they must have worked ! Yes, and not only they. Last month we applauded the publishers for the attractive format of the series; now compositors and proof-readers must have their mead of praise. In the 266 packed pages of this volume we have noted only three small errors: " best " for " but " on p. 182, l. 4; " Church's " for " Churches " in the footnote on p. 214; and the omission of a bracket in the second quotation on the page following.

A Member of C.S.M.V.

The Papacy and the Modern State. By F. R. Hoare. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 15s.

This is an extreme book, in that the author maintains a very simple and rigid view of the authority of the Church to pronounce upon all questions connected with the moral life of man, and of the monarchical authority of the Pope in the Church as in principle constant throughout Church history. But it is not a naïve book, and it does not smell of the sacristy. Mr (or is it Father ?) Hoare is capable of appreciating the varieties of secularism and liberalism, and his analyses of these varieties, though always external and aloof, are by no means superficial. If we miss altogether the sense of complexity of the social and political problem, of inter-related planes, of the necessity of some kind of pluralism in which the Church is not the supreme and final autocratic sovereign, which we find in the writings of Maritain, we do find here someone who can interpret the meaning of the Medieval Papacy, the worship of Cæsar, and modern totalitarianism, because he quite clearly believes that unity of belief within one political and social community is and ought to be the normal thing. Liberalism is no more than an interlude between one integration and another, though it may last as long as the interlude between Diocletian and Charlemagne, between the god-emperor and the Holy Roman Emperor crowned by the Pope.

This book ought to help English people to appreciate some of the reasons for Roman Catholic complacency towards the totalitarian states. It is not that the author is uncritical of Hitler or of Mussolini, though he writes of the latter more in sorrow than in anger, as of one who has missed two chances of standing forth as the champion of Christian civilization. (Others may be thankful that recent events have so far diminished that danger.) But he clearly regards parliamentary government and the party system as unnatural and unstable institutions, certain to be wrecked on the Continent, though the outward frame of the former may survive for a while in England, where it is so intimately bound up with traditions older than liberalism. For

parliamentarianism assumes an agreement to differ about fundamental beliefs, the bad English idea that a man's religion is something private and personal which ought not to affect his social behaviour, from which infection he notes that English Roman Catholics are by no means free. This agreement to differ is only possible, however, where there is agreement about some things, as there was in Victorian England about personal morality and the eternity of economic laws. When these hard crusts are broken disintegration must continue until authority, pagan or Christian, is again established. In this situation the revival of the god-state is as natural and inevitable as its first establishment. It is the way forward from liberalism, though it leads direct to the persecution of the Church.

It may well be felt that this view exaggerates the individualism of English religion. The last six months have proved that the English people have unexpected reserves of solidarity and loyalty to one another. But it is as well that we should have, in English, an estimate of the political situation in England and in Europe which, though uncommon in England, is probably very much more common among continental and Irish Roman Catholics than the more complicated estimates of Bernanos and Maritain. The idea of a bloc of authoritarian states of Catholic culture to oppose the influence of Russia, America, *and* the Nazis has been used by Axis propagandists to separate the French from the British Empire, but it has been used, and will be used again, by British propagandists to separate Italy and Austria from Prussia. And it would be no use to either of them if it was a political impossibility. The most serious obstacle to it is the character of Paris, Munich, and Vienna, recalcitrant to any kind of regimentation, red, brown, or black-cassocked.

GEORGE EVERY, S.S.M.

CAPTIVE FLAMES. By R. A. Knox. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 5s.

The panegyric is a form of homily rarely heard in Anglican pulpits, but it is capable of becoming the vehicle of valuable teaching, and the story, if skilfully narrated, forms its own exhortation. Mgr Knox has gathered a number of such orations under the title *Captive Flames*, borrowed from a stanza by Henry Vaughan.

The best of the collection is the panegyric on Chesterton delivered in Westminster Cathedral, which boldly claims that Chesterton was " one of the very greatest men of his time . . . a great and solitary figure in literature, an artist in words and ideas, with an astonishing fecundity of imaginative vision ".

Some of the sketches are full of interest, but they have not the clearness or the vivid portraiture of which the late Canon Mackay was a master. He would have given us a more appealing

portrait of that delightful but puzzling character, St Thomas More. Mgr Knox says little of the *Utopia*, with its oddly subversive ideas. How far it reflected the real feelings of its author is a study for the psycho-analyst.

Scarcely one of these discourses is free from a sneer or a slighting reference to Protestantism, or a disparagement of the Anglican Church. This is not so much a blemish—probably it was to the taste of the hearers—as an unconscious betrayal of uneasiness. If a speaker is always referring to the decline or decay of some institution, it is not seldom a case of " wishful thinking ", and sometimes of fear. When Charles II attempted to dissuade the poet Waller from allowing his daughter to ally herself with " a falling Church " by marrying a priest of the Church of England, the poet replied: " The king does me much honour by interesting himself in my domestic concerns, but I have lived long enough to know that this falling Church hath a trick of rising again."

Perhaps if the preacher had remembered this, he would not have allowed occasional jarring sentences to mar his otherwise felicitous panegyrics.

MARCUS DONOVAN.

SHORTER NOTICES

The number of books dealing with prayer, or designed to help readers in the practice of this holy art, shows no sign of falling off. Three such volumes are in my parcel. *Prayers of Citizenship*, by Kenneth Henderson (Longmans, 3s. 6d.), contains a number of meditations and prayers intended for those who wish to prepare themselves for helping to build a new world based on Christianity. There is nothing of very great value in the book, which, alike in the prayers and the meditations, is given to much wordiness. The Bishop of Liverpool commends it as a link between Christians at home and overseas. The author is an Australian priest-journalist. *Vision, Work and Service*, by Reginald Wilde (Allen and Unwin, 3s. 6d.), is another somewhat scrappy book. It brings together a number of quotations for each day in the month, together with a few prayers based on the same theme. The author's intention is " to guide the reader into the habit of systematic prayer and spiritual thought-control ". *Behold how Good and Joyful* (C.L.A., 6d.) contains a preface by Fr O'Brien, S.S.J.E., and consists of a number of outline meditations on Christian unity intended for use in connexion with the Week of Prayer for Unity.

In *God and the Bible* (Mowbrays, 1s. 6d.) the Bishop of Southampton directs his readers' attention away from the changing scenes of life to the eternal reality which lies behind them—a

welcome line of teaching in these present days. Few men can write a " little book " on religion so clearly as the Bishop of Brechin. In *The Christian Life* (C.L.A., 1s.), a volume of some sixty pages, he gives admirable and simple teaching about the " things which a Christian ought to know and believe to his soul's health ". For confirmation candidates it should prove especially useful.

Last, but by no means least, is a delightful anthology, *The Christian Heritage* (Methuen, 6s.). Its editor is Canon Basil Redlich, and he has aimed at providing a book for reading in the quiet hours of life or in the camps and trenches of war. Each of the fifty-two themes is dealt with under four headings—a passage from the Bible, a prose extract, a poem and a prayer. The work of selection has been well and carefully done, and the result is a book of unusual quality and charm.

H. L. HUBBARD.

Canon Barry, in *Faith in Dark Ages* (S.C.M. Press, 2s. 6d.), writes so fearlessly and refreshingly of familiar problems which the war propounds—the defence of democracy, Christian compromise, the vindication of right and the Christian interpretation of history—that I wish he had gone just a little (only a little) further and considered the problem which Christians must and, without disloyalty, *can* face—the possibility and implications of British defeat in arms. But what he does say is *very* good. War is the extreme case of the clash between our ideals and the demand for Christian realism in a world which is the sphere of God's activity and yet has its goal beyond history. The present war is vital to the defence of Christendom, but it is dangerous to speak of it as a crusade; National Days of Prayer are not wise, and revivals of tribal religion must be avoided. Victory in the field is not necessarily the " victory " for which we are fighting—which is spiritual rebirth. And the " grim paradox " is that only a small minority of British people have " any clear, conscious understanding " of the real issues. Both at home and overseas " the defence of Christendom is bound up with the positive proclamation of the Gospel ". He rejects liberalism and pays homage to the theology of crisis; but perhaps his last word is that " Christianity rightly understood is the redemption and the crown of humanism ".

That could certainly not be said of Mr Glendenning's essay in popular Barthianism, *The Faith of God* (Allenson, 5s.), which is a salutary recall to the doctrine of justification by faith and away from the tendency of most contemporary sociological thought in this country to regard Christianity as the handmaid of the New Order. " Is this not the reason why the Holy Spirit is not given us, as in the early Church, because we ask Him with a view to possessing and using Him as a power with which to

conquer our temptations, direct our lives and remake the world ? Whereas it is He who is to possess and control us." It is written in popular style and abounds in happy expressions and independent (sometimes hasty ?) judgments. But I do not think I should have followed his argument without previous acquaintance with his theme. And I still do not understand his psychology. The trichotomy of body, mind, and Ego, with Faith, in the Christian, as a fourth independent factor operating largely through the body, is to me neither biblical nor scientific.

Mr Ross Wallace's *The Three Pillars* (Chapman and Hall, 5s.) is an attempt to meet " the need of a textbook which can be put in the hands of the sixth-form master to help him in an outline course of theology ". It falls between a discursive—not to say chatty—style, more suitable for the boys than their teachers, and the attempt to include a large quantity of material which, in the 183 pages available, would have been better presented in the form of succinct summaries with carefully chosen references for further reading. The sixth-form master, who was sufficiently ignorant of Christianity to need and accept such a naïve introduction, would require considerable help in preparing a two-years' course on this basis. It is curious that a textbook of Christian theology should rest content with the Thomist proofs of the existence of God and have no word to say of the biblical doctrines of God, of judgment, or of history. It is difficult, if uncharitable, not to suspect that the author's violent attack on Communism as " the focal centre of all opposition to the established order in Church and State " is in some way bound up with an attitude of mind which can rest content with a stable universe in which " St Thomas's logic speaks for itself and his argument remains, as it always was and always will be, clear, simple, unshakable "; a Newtonian physics in which the laws of nature are immutable; a Euclidian geometry in which the angles of a triangle are always equal to two right angles; and a human society in which apparently the only moral problem is sexual. But the sixth-form boy leaves school for a changing world of crisis and moral frustration, and he will need a surer foothold against the thoughtful Marxism, which is at least trying to meet the problems, and the indifference which is still the more common alternative. If such a book is needed (and there is ample evidence that it is), it might be valuably suggested that, when Dr Whale's recent lectures at Cambridge are published, they should be accompanied by a bibliography having the possibility of their sixth-form use in mind.

F. B. Welbourn.

War—What does the Bible Say ? By J. R. Coates. C.N.L. Books: Sheldon Press. 1s. 6d.

This small book possesses two distinctive merits. It honestly seeks to justify its title, and as a result there will be many who will

be grateful that in so large a number of cases the passages of Scripture are quoted in full and not just given footnote references. In the second place the author is not concerned to tell us what he thinks the Bible would have said if he had written it. Instead here is a clear and lucid assessment of a topic upon which many people seem to find it hard to retain any sense of perspective. The author traces through the Bible a process, almost an argument in four stages: "War as a Duty", "War as a Problem", "War as a Judgment", and "The War against War". Here in compassable form is a synopsis of the Bible from the point of view of its teaching on this subject.

Christianity and the Machine Age. By Eric Gill. C.N.L. Books: Sheldon Press. 1s. 6d.

This collection of aphorisms carefully threaded to form an argument is Eric Gill's last will and testament, the handing on, as it were, of his sword to those who will follow him in the quest for that order of society in which man's whole life shall be truly integrated. The strength and the weakness of the author's argument is illuminated by his recently published *Autobiography*, which is a necessary background to this book on the Machine Age. There will be many who will welcome the sincerity of his protest against a world that is enslaved to the machine, a protest which was illustrated by all he said and did. But the conviction remains that his diagnosis of the Machine Age did not really go deep enough, and like every protestant he overstated his case. But the case is an impressive one. Until Christian men in large numbers have come to the point which Eric Gill reached they will never be able to go on from the point where he left off. In this primer of protest there is a fine definition of Christianity and a most illuminating enquiry into the nature of man, art and that capitalist-industrialism which is the distinctive world disorder in which we live. He that hath ears to hear, let him hear.

War and the Purpose of God. By W. W. Lucas. Marshall, Morgan and Scott. 5s.

Report has it that this publisher's stock has contributed largely to the content of the six million books recently burnt in the City of London. Sympathy for the publishers cannot help being tempered with the hope that the stock of this volume did not escape the holocaust. It is difficult to see any valuable purpose that this book can hope to serve. The author has given an exhaustive and exhausting list of references gathered indiscriminately from the whole Bible to illustrate the theme that the Lord is a Man of War. The book repudiates any attempt to distinguish between the relative value of different books, and apparently every text is of precisely the same value as an index of the mind of God. If you've got 5s. to spend, don't.

M. C. A. Warren.

BISHOP CHANDLER: A MEMOIR. By C. P. S. Clarke. Mowbrays. 3s. 6d.

The Archdeacon of Chichester in this little book of 128 pages with its two portraits has achieved a sober picture of a gracious son of Christian Oxford: upon a canvas of his deeds and beliefs appears the face of the Bishop "so loveable, humorous, and charged with joy". He is much helped in this by quoting from the letters that have been sent him by the Bishop's friends, giving their short and pithy impressions of the Bishop and his work: and the emerging account, though not detailed, nor attempting profundity, is orderly and lucid, reminiscent of the sketches of Edward King, who also escaped a full-blown biography. Those sketches are frequently in use for Meal-Time Reading at Retreats and Quiet Days, and these may serve a similar purpose. Chapter II, "Poplar, 1891-1901", would be especially suitable for this: here the Vice-Principal of Brasenose, leaving a nest of mental and physical delights, goes out to tackle the evangelization of industrial England. The conditions he encountered are still so much our own that the wisdom of his method of assault is not out of date, and much of it is now in the new experiment in Poplar bearing fruit in the whole Deanery. Chapter VI, on the Bishop's books, does little more than catalogue them and hint at their contents. There are no extracts, but *Ara Coeli* would seem to be the most suitable companion for Chapter II at Meal-Time Readings. Chapters III-IV are the record of his years as a Bishop in South Africa, 1902-1920. "His name will go down in history as the real builder of the Bloemfontein Diocese" (p. 72). Perhaps this part of the book has a long future, for the Diocese may well treasure an account of its Theodore of Tarsus, the rough travellings of his pastoral soul in cars and carts, the coming of the S.S.M. to Modderport, his growing holiness, the Retreats and his practice of meditation. In 1920 his health broke down and he became a country rector at Bentley, near Winchester, and so remained for sixteen years, affecting the Church at large by his books and his wise leadership of the Anglo-Catholic Party. That may have been as much as his health would permit, but it is sad that this High Churchman with his real loyalty to the Prayer Book was never even invited to join or head a cathedral staff.

R. P. SYMONDS.

HANDBOOK TO THE CAMBRIDGESHIRE SYLLABUS OF RELIGIOUS TEACHING. S.C.M. 4s. 6d.

Excellent syllabuses of religious instruction have been compiled over the past few years, but some of them have proved much too difficult for the teachers, whose training in this particular side of their work is anything but adequate. Hence attempts have been made to assist the teachers by "Handbooks" prepared for use with agreed syllabuses. Last year there appeared a *Hand-*

book of Christian Teaching to supplement the *Oxford Handbook of Religious Knowledge*, and now a "Handbook" has been prepared under the direction of the Institute of Christian Education for use with the Cambridgeshire Syllabus of Religious Teaching. Dr B. A. Yeaxlee has written the book, and it seems to us to be most admirable for its purpose, and provides the background which teachers require to understand. The teaching is up-to-date, well presented and orthodox. It is a thoroughly competent piece of work, as indeed we should expect from Dr Yeaxlee. The only point that occurs to us is whether it will be used. It is none too simple, and, as we have urged repeatedly, these books must be introduced to the Training Colleges and University departments where teachers are receiving training. If "Handbooks" of this type are expounded by competent divinity lecturers, they will be used by the teachers in the schools, otherwise they may be neglected.

W. J. Brown.

The English Church and how it Works. By Cecilia M. Ady. Faber and Faber. 10s. 6d.

There can be few institutions so perplexing to the outside observer as the Church of England; and Miss Ady has performed a valuable service in this excellent attempt to describe it. She wisely begins by considering its purely institutional side, describing its officers and councils, its legal and financial position, and its relationship to the State. She recognizes that the Church of to-day has its roots in history and cannot even be accurately *described* if regarded only as a present-day fact; yet she never allows her incursions into history to divert her from her main purpose of explanation. Miss Ady is at home with the powers and procedure of the Convocations and the Church Assembly, with Parochial Church Councils and the Ecclesiastical Commission; and she can explain intricate details without being dull. Probably it will be news to most Church-people that the consecration of a Bishop in the southern province must take place at Canterbury unless the Chapter consent to the ceremony being performed elsewhere. Only rarely have we detected inaccuracies. Thus on p. 37 she includes "inducting new incumbents" among the functions of rural deans, and later refers to induction "by the archdeacon or rural dean"; in fact (apart from the case of a few peculiars), it is always the archdeacon who inducts, and the rural dean has no concern in the matter except that—like other incumbents—he may act on behalf of the archdeacon in his absence. It is also a mistake to assert that sidesmen are elected at a joint session of the vestry and parochial church meeting: the vestry has no voice now in their election, which is in the hands of the parochial church meeting and the incumbent. Miss Ady's judgment that the

House of Laity in the Church Assembly " reflects with fidelity the varied opinions, prejudices, and ideals of English Church-people " is only given as an opinion; but it seems a rather rash assertion in view of the facts that nearly every member is either old or middle-aged and that only about one per cent. belong to the artisan class, who provide the overwhelming majority of communicants and Church workers.

In the second half of the book Miss Ady goes behind the organization to the inner life of the Church. Here again her task was no easy one: but she has succeeded—thanks largely to her sound historical sense—in painting a picture the truth of which no thoughtful Churchman of any school can question. She gives full weight to each of the various strands that make up Church life to-day; and she very rightly emphasizes the real spirit of unity that underlies our apparent divergencies—a unity which is constantly recognized by those of us who are in close touch with parishes of various " colours ". There is an admirable chapter on the Church's impact on society, and we are glad that Archbishop Davidson's intervention in the General Strike of 1926 is given its proper significance. There is little to criticize and much to appreciate in the remaining chapters, which discuss the relation of the Church to its sister Churches of the Anglican Communion and to the other Christian Communions. Every reader will learn more about the Church; and though its defects are not concealed, we can view it with pride and thankfulness.

PERCY HARTILL.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.)

ALLEN AND UNWIN: A. P. Ushenko, *The Problem of Logic* (7s. 6d.).

BURNS OATES AND WASHBOURNE: J. O'Connell, *The General Rubrics of the Missal* (10s. 6d.).

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS: John Oman, *Honest Religion* (7s. 6d.); F. W. B. Bullock, *The History of Ridley Hall, Cambridge*, Vol. I (18s.).

CENTENARY PRESS: R. Lloyd, *The Mastery of Evil* (3s. 6d.).

CLARENDON PRESS: H. H. Price, *Hume's Theory of the External World* (15s.)

DACRE PRESS: A. H. Rees, *The Catholic Church and Corporate Reunion* (1s.).

EPWORTH PRESS: G. B. Robson, *The Mind of Jesus Christ* (5s.).

GOLLANCZ: John Strachey, *A Faith to Fight For* (6s.).

HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS: G. B. Burch, *The Steps of Humility*, by Bernard, Abbot of Clairvaux (16s. 6d.).

LONGMANS: J. Broderick, *The Origin of the Jesuits* (10s. 6d.).

MACMILLAN: N. Kemp Smith, *The Philosophy of David Hume* (25s.).

MONAHAN, W. B.: *St Thomas Aquinas on the Eucharist* (7s. 6d., published by author).

MOWBRAYS: A. W. F. Blunt, *For Beginners in Prayer* (1s. 6d.); R. Johnston, *In Secret* (2s.).

NATIONAL SOCIETY AND S.P.C.K.: R. L. Arundale, *School Worship Day by Day* (2s. 6d.).

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS: *The Poems of Alice Meynell* (4s.).

SANDS: E. C. Messenger, *Keep Thou my Soul* (5s.); Presbyter, *Spiritual Voyage* (1s. 6d.).

S.C.M. PRESS: William Temple, *The Hope of a New World* (3s. 6d.); J. O. Dobson, *Worship* (5s.).

SECKER AND WARBURG: Lewis Mumford, *Faith for Living* (7s. 6d.).

S.P.C.K.: A. R. Browne-Wilkinson: *The Teaching of the Church Catechism* (3s.); M. C. Buchanan, *Yet Forty Days* (1s. 6d.).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher